Vol. XL 1 JANUARY, 1909 No. 1

Ecclesiastical Review

BX
801
E17
v.40

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy

Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

A CRITICAL VALUATION OF LOISY'S THEORIES 1
The Rev. A. VIEBAN, S.S., J.C.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Maryland.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION.....15
The Rev J. P. SHIELDS, A.M., S.T.B., Turtle Creek, Penna.

SHOULD WE PLEAD FOR A VERNACULAR LITURGY?.....29
The Rev. C. A. CAMPBELL, D.D., Halifax, N. S., Canada.

THE BLINDNESS OF THE VERY REVEREND DOCTOR GRAY: or THE FINAL LAW. A Novel of Clerical Life..... 48
Chapter VII: Raptures and Remorse.....48
Chapter VIII: A Christmas Gift..... 58
Chapter IX: A Question in Theology.....66

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECT OF RELIGION IN POLITICS.....90
JAMES A. McNULTY, Philadelphia, Pa.

RECENT LITERATURE ON THE HISTORY OF RELIGION..... 104

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE.

PHILADELPHIA, 1305 ARCH STREET

American Ecclesiastical Review

Subscription Price, Three Dollars and Fifty Cents a Year

Subscription Price, Foreign, Fifteen Shillings a Year

COPYRIGHT, 1908
THE DOLPHIN PRESS

R. and T. WASHBOURNE, Ltd., 4 Paternoster Row, London, England
W. P. LINEHAN, 309 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia

Entered June 5, 1908, as second-class matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879

St. Bernard's Seminary
Altar Wine

THE Seminary owns sixty acres of Vineyard in full bearing. Its wine is made under the direct supervision of the BISHOP, and has his ABSOLUTE GUARANTEE of purity. It is made from the juice of the grape and advantage is not taken of the permission given to use cognac for fortification. *No dealer has this wine for sale.*

One case of 25 bottles	$6.00
One keg of 5 gallons	5.50
One keg of 10 gallons	10.00
One keg of 23 gallons	20.00
One barrel	40.00
One case of 25 bottles of "Elvira" Wine	9.00

SEND FOR CIRCULAR

The sale of this Wine is in charge of the Rev. M. J. NOLAN, D.D., Chancellor, Rochester, N. Y., to whom all communications should be addressed.

ALTAR WINES BEYOND DOUBT

FROM THE

Sacred Heart Novitiate, Los Gatos, Cal.

MALVOISIE. Mild, dry wine; free from all acidity; pinkish in color; agreeable; digestible; excellent quality. Per gal., $1.10; per doz., $4.00. In bbl. lots and over, $1.00 per gal.

NOVITIATE. Generous and full-bodied; somewhat sweet and resembles the Spanish wines; is the highest form of absolutely pure wine of its kind produced on this continent. Does not require bottling. Per gal., $1.50; per doz., $5.00.

Made by ourselves especially for the purpose D. GIACOBBI, S.J., Rector.

SOLE AGENTS, **BARNSTON TEA CO.**

P. A. MAHONY, Treas. and Sec. **No. 6 BARCLAY ST., New York.**

MR. J. W. DONNELLY.

To the Right Rev. and Rev. Clergy:

We fully understand the deep responsibility that rests on the conscientious dealer in

ALTAR WINE

With this knowledge in view, and having devoted a lifetime to this business, we can with confidence recommend the following choice wines as being VALID and LICIT for use at the Holy Sacrifice, namely:

"Collegiate"—A fine mellow wine used at the Jesuit Colleges.

"Santa Clara"—An agreeable, tart wine, made at Santa Clara College, Cal.

"Jurançon"—The old favorite altar wine, delicate and delicious.

"Vin de Tours"—A little sweeter than Jurançon, and equally desirable.

THESE WINES ARE VERY GRATEFUL TO THE FASTING STOMACH

Please write us for Price List and Circular, containing instructions for bottling, treatment of frozen wine, and other information. Address,

THE DONNELLY BROTHERS Altar Wine Merchants TROY, N. Y.

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM:

Non potest permitti Missae Celebratio in Sacellis Coemeteriorum, in quibus non habetur præscripta distantia altarium a loculis 74
Altaria mobilia in sepulcreto tollerari possunt, dummodo mensa solidis basibus adhaereat, et altare in uno loco stabiliter collocetur 74
Festum SS. Ambrosii et Caroli ad ritum dupl. maj. in Dioecesibus Provin. Mediolanen. suffraganeis elevatur 75
Novae Lectiones in festo S. Bonaventurae 76
Additiones et Variationes in Breviario et Missali Romano 78
Antistites Americae, Oceaniae et Australiae, perdurante maritimo itinere, Sacrum in navi singulis diebus peragere possunt 80
Circa Indulta officiorum Vot. de SS. Sacramento et de Imm. Conceptione B.M.V. 80
S. Joannes Chrysostomus Patronus Concionatorum declaratur 81
De Ordine servando circa Commemorationes in sec. Vesperis et de versu "Fidelium animae" 82

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM

Indulgentiae pro Scapulare de Monte Carmelo gestantibus 83
Licet separare ad libitum singulas decadas Rosarii 85
Indulgentia adnectitur duabus Orationibus pro Clericis 86

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 87
Binding Force of the Decisions of the Roman Congregations (*Docibilis*) 88
Pastoral Relations of our Missionary Clergy under the new Roman Congregations 89
The Constitutional Aspect of Religion in Politics (*James A. McNulty*) 90
Can the "Sanatio in Radice" be applied? 93
Withdrawal from Secret Societies 94
Genuflecting after Communion 95
Head-covering of Women in Church 96
Flowers on a Consecrated Altar 97
Franciscalia—New and Forthcoming Books 98
Father Slater's Moral Theology (*Studiosus*) 100
The term "Modernism" according to Ruskin (*L. B.*) 101
Clerics and Tobacco 102

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Sacred Scripture: History of Religion—General Works; Religion of Israel—the Theory of Evolution; the Mythical Theory; Wundt's Theory; Primitive Revelation 104

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Preuss: A Study in American Freemasonry 114
Dehon: Le Plan de la Franc-Maconnerie en Italie et en France 114
King: Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life 116
Willems: Philosophia Moralis 118
Hickey: Summula Philosophiae Scholasticae 118
Dewe: History of Economics 120
Parsons-Cronenberger: Sermons 121
Miller: Sermons on Modern Spiritualism 121
Devine: Pentecost Preaching 121
Morisot: Instructions sur les Fêtes de l'Année 121
Laborie: Les Péchés Capitaux 121

LITERARY CHAT 123

BOOKS RECEIVED 127

Until 31 January, 1909

THE

Ecclesiastical Review

1909 Year Book 1909

FOR

PRIESTS

+ + +

IT IS NOT FOR SALE

+ + +

In size it conforms to THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, and is designed to be a daily vade-mecum for the Clergy.

The CONTENTS of this YEAR BOOK for Priests—

RUBRICS for the Mass and Office, *in English.*
ORDO for the Mass and Office, chiefly *in English*, and arranged after a wholly *novel plan.* On the opposite (odd) pages are:—
FORECASTS and **ANNOUNCEMENTS**, for the different days and seasons of the year; also ample blank space for
MEMORANDA, at the option of the user.
DIGEST, by way of easy review, of several leading pastoral topics.
ROMAN DOCUMENTS for 1908, in brief, with a good *Index* for quick reference to same.
ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE published during 1908 (Books in English and in Latin)—Sacred Scripture, Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, Church History, Philosophy.
CLERICAL INFORMATION for practical purposes.

This volume will be published annually, for the convenience of the REVIEW subscribers. No doubt many pastors will adopt it for their Sunday announcements, and preserve it as a record for future reference and comparison.

To every subscriber to the REVIEW whose subscription for 1909 is paid before 31 January, 1909, this YEAR BOOK is complimentary. It goes to no others, and is not for sale to any one.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES.—VOL. X.—(XL).—JANUARY, 1909.—No. 1.

A CRITICAL VALUATION OF LOISY'S THEORIES.

DR. LEPIN, Professor of Sacred Scripture in the Seminary of Lyons, has recently published another volume [1] dealing with Loisy's views. The work has a twofold purpose; first, to analyze Loisy's theories, "to determine their relation to the Catholic faith and to see whether ecclesiastical authority could tolerate them or fail to condemn them," (pp. 1-233); secondly, "to examine in what measure these theories can pretend to represent the latest results of criticism . . . to appreciate their value from a strictly scientific point of view" (pp. 234-371).

The author is well known to the readers of the REVIEW. His *Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu* has reached in a short time a third edition, and is rightly considered to be one of the best refutations of Loisy's *L'Évangile et l'Église* and *Autour d'un petit livre.* Other works on the origin of the fourth Gospel and on the propositions of the Syllabus "Lamentabili" dealing with Christology have also been favorably received.[2]

In all these works Dr. Lepin shows a thorough acquaintance with the literature of his subject. He has read and analyzed all the works of any importance bearing upon it. If he main-

[1] *Les Théories de M. Loisy.* Exposé et Critique par M. Lepin, Professeur à l'Ecole supérieure de Théologie de Lyon. Paris, G. Beauchesne & Cie., 1908.

[2] *L'Origine du quatrième Évangile* and *Christologie.*

tains the traditional views, he cannot be accused of doing so without hearing the other side. By his works, even more than by his repeated declarations, he proves that there is no opposition between loyalty to the Catholic faith and the progress of Bible studies. In his latest volume he has fully realized the object he proposes to himself, namely, to convince the thoughtful reader that Loisy's theories are opposed not only to Catholic faith but also to scientific criticism. The purpose of this article is, with the aid of Dr. Lepin's work, briefly to examine M. Loisy's writings and to point out the *a priori* character of his method. The reader will better understand the trend of this method if we recall some of the antecedents which may have helped to shape it.

I.

Alfred Loisy was born 28 February, 1857, at Ambrières, in the Department of Marne. In 1874 he entered the diocesan seminary of Châlons; after completing his theological studies, (June, 1878) he received sub-deaconship and, in the fall of the same year, entered the Catholic University of Paris. Returning to his diocese the following year, he was ordained priest, 29 June, 1879, and for two years exercised the functions of the pastoral ministry. He was professor of Hebrew and Exegesis in the Catholic University of Paris from 1881 until he had to resign his chair when Leo XIII issued his Encyclical on Holy Scripture (1893). From 1894 to 1899 he acted as chaplain to the Dominican nuns of Neuilly (Seine). In 1899 he retired to Bellevue, in the diocese of Versailles and obtained a government position as Lecturer on Biblical, Exegesis in "L'École des Hautes Études." This position he resigned in 1904. Since that time he has lived in the country, first at Garnay, in the diocese of Chartres, then from the early part of 1907, at Ceffonds, near Montier-en-der (Haute-Marne), where he is at present.

Although Loisy has long been known for his advanced views, and although some of his articles had been censured by the Archbishop of Paris, it was not till the fall of 1902 that

his open conflict with ecclesiastical authority began with the publication of a little book on the Gospel and the Church.[3] His purpose, he said, was to examine Harnack's Lectures on the Essence of Christianity, "not precisely to refute the work, but to determine its exact position in regard to history." The Berlin professor had maintained that the essence of the Christian religion consists in an attitude of filial trust and confidence in God as our Father: for this was the essence of Christ's teaching, His one message to men; it was this that made Him preëminently the Son of God—He, more than any other, had a lively consciousness of this filial relation.

Loisy found it easy enough to show that the theory rests on but a few texts of the Gospel, to the neglect of others which occupy a more prominent place in the teaching of Jesus. Hence, he concluded that Harnack's theory "does away with the essential elements of Christianity."[4] Nor is it less in opposition to reason than to the Gospel: for a purely internal religion is only for pure spirits, not for men. What then is the essence of the Gospel and of Christianity? Loisy answers: the Kingdom of God. Christ's one message to men was the announcement of that Kingdom, i. e. of a transformation which would bring about on earth an era of righteousness and happiness. His mission was to prepare men to participate in the blessings to come. He thought of Himself only as God's agent for the establishment of the Kingdom; He did not teach a body of doctrine, nor institute the Church and the sacraments. However, the Catholic Church to-day is the continuation of the society formed around Christ: for in it, as in the Apostolic College, we find the expectation of the Kingdom (although in a different sense), an external organization and the preaching of righteousness. The ecclesiastical organization, the dogmas and the sacraments of the Church, are not indeed founded on the authentic teaching of Jesus, but they are its necessary and therefore legitimate developments.

Some few readers saw in the work a strong refutation of

[3] *L'Évangile et l'Église.*

[4] Op. cit. p. 112.

liberal Protestantism and a powerful defence of the Church; but most Catholics asked themselves: How can we believe in Christ's Divinity, if He was not conscious of it; or in the Church and the sacraments, if He had no thought or intention of instituting them? Hence, little surprise was expressed when Cardinal Richard condemned (17 January, 1903) *L'Évangile et l'Église* as a work calculated to shake the faith of Catholics in the fundamental dogmas of the Church. Loisy apparently submitted, for he wrote: "I condemn and reprove the errors which have been deduced from my book by interpreting it from a point of view entirely different from my own in writing it" (2 February, 1903).

In the fall of the same year, he published *Autour d'un petit livre*, intended to explain and to defend *L'Évangile et l'Église*. In this new volume he places himself "among those who profess loyalty to science and to the Church." He declares that "he had spent his life in showing that the profession of Catholicism is compatible with the full exercise of reason and with freedom of critical research." Such protests were not sufficient to give assurance of the writer's soundness in the faith; for he had carefully avoided answering the question which was in the mind of all his readers: Does Loisy believe that Christ really rose from the dead; that He is really God; that He is truly present in the Eucharist?

Two months after its publication, *Autour d'un petit livre* was censured by the Holy Office, together with other works of the same author, as containing "numerous and grave errors, principally on the nature of primitive revelation, on the authenticity of evangelical facts and teachings, on Christ's Divinity and His knowledge, on the institution of the Church and the sacraments." [5] Loisy's attitude under this condemnation has been fully revealed recently by certain letters written at that time and lately published by him with a view "to justify his conduct toward the Church and to justify himself in the opinion of honest men." [6] Thus he wrote to Von Hügel

[5] Letter of Cardinal Merry del Val to Cardinal Richard, 19 Dec., 1903.
[6] *Quelques lettres*, (Ceffonds, 1908).

(29 December, 1903): "I have made up my mind to receive the condemnation with respect, reserving, however, the right of my conscience and my opinions as a historian;" again, 3 January, 1904, he wrote to the same: "My intention is to send to Cardinal Merry del Val what will be called the author's submission." On the same day he wrote to Cardinal Richard: "I intend to send soon to His Eminence the Cardinal Secretary of State the act of my adhesion to the judgment of the S. Congregations." Whereupon the official organ of the Archdiocese of Paris announced Loisy's submission. He complained of this to his friends, on the ground that it would destroy his reputation among the learned; and without coming into the open himself, he had P. Sabatier insert in *Le Siècle* a note which was reproduced in *Le Temps*, explaining that his submission was not a retractation of any of his views.[7]

On 11 January he wrote to Cardinal Merry del Val as follows: "I receive with respect the judgment of the S. Congregations, and I condemn whatever may be worthy of condemnation in my writings . . . I do not however give up or retract opinions which I have put forward as a historian or as a critical exegete." This being found insufficient, he wrote 26 January: "I accept all the dogmas of the Church, and if, in unfolding their history in the books which have recently been condemned, I have expressed opinions contrary to faith, I have said, and I repeat, that I condemn in those books whatever from the point of view of faith may be wrong." In a letter to the Holy Father, (28 February), he declares: "I want to live and die in the communion of the Catholic Church. I do not want to help to destroy the faith in my country. It is not, however, in my power to undo in myself the result of my work." At the same time, as a proof of good-will he offered to give up his teaching in the Government School and to defer the publication of some writings. The Holy See, through Cardinal Richard, insisted on a clearer retractation of the errors contained in his books. Loisy answered

[7] Letter to Von Hügel, 10 Jan., 1904.

(12 March): "Out of a spirit of obedience to the Holy See, I condemn the errors condemned by the Holy Office in my writings." Urged by Cardinal Richard to write to the Holy Father and to make a "full and filial submission," he maintained silence and, having given up his Government position, he left the neighborhood of Paris and retired to Garnay, in the diocese of Chartres (July, 1904). The Holy See was not yet satisfied; still it withheld his condemnation.

In his retreat Loisy continued to write in the same vein for several reviews. Meanwhile he said Mass daily in his house, having previously (October, 1899) obtained the requisite faculty. As this privilege was about to expire, he sought to have it extended. For this purpose he wrote to the Bishop of Chartres, in whose diocese he was, then to his own bishop of Châlons, and finally to Cardinal Richard, but without avail. In some of the letters of that period he bitterly complained of this refusal; but in others he found it natural enough that the permission should not have been granted.[8] Consequently, he said Mass for the last time on 2 November, 1906. He did not however leave the Church then, but remained "to continue the work of transformation" which he considered to be "equally important for his country and for the progress of humanity."[9]

Early in 1907 Loisy left Garnay and took up his residence at Ceffonds, near Montier-en-der (Haute Marne), where he is at present. He continued to wear the clerical garb and to go to Mass on Sundays. About this time articles which openly denied the doctrines of the Trinity and of Christ's Virgin birth, brought about the condemnation of the *Revue d'Histoire et de Littèrature religieuses*, to which Loisy was one of the leading contributors. The periodical suspended publication in December, 1907.

In letters of this period he tells how, for years, he had felt misgivings about the traditional view of Catholicism; how he

[8] We cannot but wonder that he should have desired to say Mass after he had lost his faith in the Real Presence and in his priesthood.

[9] Letter of 28 Dec., 1906, to a priest.

had found peace of mind, not by "bowing blindly to the authority of the Church, but by gradually forming a personal opinion on Catholic beliefs, their origin and their history" (28 January, 1907). He admitted that there is not a single article of the Creed which he understands in the same sense as the Church, and that the whole Catholic system had appeared to him as doomed twenty years before (20 January, 1907). In the same letter he calls the commonly received view of revelation childish. He adopts Tyrrell's idea of dogmas, which are of value only for their "religious and moral significance" (5 May, 1907). Hence, the Virgin birth, the Resurrection of Christ, are not facts, but they and other dogmas contain a moral lesson which we should retain when the symbols themselves become antiquated (9 May, 1907). The claim of the Church to impose them on our belief is tyranny. Those in authority are the representatives, not the masters, of the Church (28 June, 1907). The Church is not the papal institution, but the society of the friends of truth, who must also be the friends of God. He still seems to believe in God, although he maintains that there is no conclusive proof of God's existence, and that reason inclines to pantheism (28 January, 1906). He still professes to be a Christian in so far as he believes in Christ's ideal of the kingdom, i. e. the reign of justice and happiness among men; and he claims to be a Catholic, in so far as he believes with Catholics that religion is essentially a social fact, whereas for Protestants it is individualistic (26 December, 1904). To those who question his right to style himself a Catholic, since he has no faith, he answers: "Are you certain that faith cannot exist without the mythological covering in which the first Christian generations have wrapped it?" (3 July, 1907). But his reiterated professions of Catholicism scarcely deceived anyone. As early as the year 1904, a leading French Protestant, M. Reville, wrote: "Whether he likes it or not, M. Loisy is in reality a liberal Protestant. He has nothing Catholic but the name."

When the decree *Lamentabili*, (17 July, 1907) and the en-

cylical *Pascendi,* (8 September, 1907) condemned Modernism, Loisy, in a private letter, qualified these documents as "a solemn defamation" (19 September, 1907). When requested by the Bishop of Langres, (18 January, 1908,) to submit to the condemnation, he answered that such an act on his part would be a lie.

Meanwhile, he published *Simples Réflexions* in which, while he claims that his opinions have been misrepresented, he also maintains the fundamental errors condemned by the Holy See. He, in common with other Modernists, rejects what he is pleased to call "the mythological idea of revelation, the absolute value of dogma, the absolute authority of the Church, the notion of ecclesiastical infallibility, the whole Catholic theology in its fundamental principles." [10]

Together with his criticism of the Encyclical, he published a work of over eight hundred pages on the Synoptic Gospels, which had been in preparation for some years. There we find the fullest and clearest exposition of his theories, and the thin veil which covered them in his earlier writings, is withdrawn.[11] In a long introduction of two hundred and sixty-eight pages, the author discusses the origin and historical value of the first three Gospels, then the Life and Teaching of Jesus, and comes to the following conclusions: the Gospels are not the work of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, nor of any of Christ's disciples, nor of men who had derived their information from eye-witnesses; they are rather anonymous compilations which received their present form toward the end of the first century (St. Mark, about 75; St. Matthew and St. Luke, about 100). They represent the life and teaching of Jesus as transformed and idealized by Christian thought. Criticism can uncover the historical basis which underlies that legendary development. When that work is done, the critic finds that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, preached the immediate coming of the kingdom. He went to Jerusalem, expecting a miraculous inauguration of that kingdom, instead of which

[10] Cf. Eccl. Review, May, 1908. [11] *Les Evangiles Synoptiques.*

He underwent the sentence of the ordinary criminal. His body was thrown into the common ditch. His disciples, however, soon began to think He was risen from the dead. This was the birthday of Christianity. Their faith gradually transfigured Christ's teaching and His life; they ascribed to Him miracles and prophecies; later on, the beliefs and practices of the Christian community were also credited to His account and sanctioned by His authority.[12]

Had the writer left the Church, no action would have been taken. But he persisted in his claim to be a Catholic and even an apologist of Catholicism. Could the Church remain silent? On 21 February, 1908, the Bishop of Langres, in the name of Cardinal Merry del Val, warned Loisy that, unless he retracted his errors within ten days, he would be excommunicated by name. Loisy refused in the same terms as before (19 January). The sentence of excommunication was pronounced by the Holy Office on 7 March. Since that time Loisy has not appeared in clerical garb.

Can anyone who reads the documents bearing on that conflict of six years, fail to be convinced that Loisy was not driven to his extreme views by any harsh measures of the ecclesiastical authorities? Cardinal Richard and the Holy See showed him the greatest consideration: a final condemnation was launched only when it became an imperative duty. Loisy long before had excommunicated himself by openly denying the faith, which is the first condition of membership in the Catholic Church.

II.

The theories advanced by Loisy are not less opposed to true science than to the Catholic faith. That he is a scholar and an able writer, no one will deny. But does this justify his pretensions to impose his views as the well-ascertained, or even probable, conclusions of the scientific method—and this, in opposition to continuous Christian tradition, to all Catholic, and

[12] A detailed analysis of Loisy's Introduction was given in the Eccl. Review for April, 1908.

many non-Catholic, scholars, who have devoted their lives to Bible questions and research?

On the very surface of his system, there is a lack of consistency. On the one hand he repudiates rationalism and admits that man needs a religion, the Christian religion, the Catholic religion. On the other, he takes away from the Christian religion that which makes it Christian, and from the Catholic religion, that which makes it Catholic. Who can recognize Catholicism or Christianity in a religious system which does away with the divinity of Christ, His resurrection, His presence in the Blessed Eucharist, His promises to His Church? Would such a system, which has never existed, be a working religion for mankind in general, or even for any consistent thinker? If Loisy's views are true, Christianity is, and always has been, a fraud.

But his theories, given out in the name of modern thought, are in many cases opposed to the conclusions of most Bible scholars. Only a small number of the most advanced critics, such as J. Weiss and Wrede, and in some cases not even these, share his most radical views. For in spite of his claims to be free from *a priori* notions in dealing with the Gospels his exegesis is vitiated by a system based on rationalistic principles and built, not on all the texts, but on a few arbitrarily chosen and set up as a standard by which the historical value of all the others is determined. He practically neglects the testimony of tradition and of St. Paul, and after thus isolating the Gospels from that society which is their natural guardian and interpreter, he rejects as unhistorical whatever in them does not harmonize with a purely rationalistic view of Christ's life and teaching.

1. On what grounds does he affirm that the Gospels were written by men who, not only had not been eye-witnesses of what they relate, but had not even derived their information from the disciples of Jesus? Why does he place their composition at the end of the first century? Why does he see in them only a feeble echo of Christ's teaching, a highly idealized account of His life? Because there are "legendary,"

"mythical," i. e. supernatural elements in the Gospels. "That the first Gospel was not written from personal recollection by a companion of Jesus, is clear from its composition and the non-historical character of what is special to it." [13] It contains the account of the Virgin birth, which "must have come into existence outside of Palestine . . . at a time and place in which there were no eye-witnesses, nor, indeed, any well-informed witness of the life of Jesus." [14] In the same way, it is claimed that we cannot recognize in the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts "one who was in touch with eye-witnesses of the Gospel and of the beginnings of Christianity," because "we find in his work too much legend concerning the origin of the first Christian community and the life of the Saviour Himself." [15] "Such things could have been written only when the eye-witnesses of the Gospel had well-nigh disappeared." [16] The testimony of tradition and strong intrinsic arguments in favor of the early date and the authenticity of our Gospels he sets aside, declaring that the narrative of miracles, which they contain, cannot be the work of those who had seen Christ. For one who does not *a priori* reject the supernatural, it seems more logical to examine, first, the evidence for the early date and historical value of the Gospels, and then to accept their supernatural elements as guaranteed by witnesses who were in a position to know what they relate, and who had no desire or reason to deceive.

2. The Kingdom of God, that is, the advent of an era of righteousness and happiness on earth, and the moral dispositions required to participate in the future blessings, was, according to Loisy, Christ's one thought, the one object of His preaching. Whatever in His recorded teaching is not in harmony with this, or goes beyond it, cannot be historical; it represents, not the words of Christ, but the thought of the Church at the end of the first century. Now, even granting

[13] *Les Evangiles Synoptiques,* I, p. 141.
[14] Ibid, p. 140.
[15] Ibid, p. 172.
[16] Ibid, p. 179.

that the thought of the imminence of the kingdom is as prominent in the Gospel as Loisy makes it, does this give us a right to set aside, as the product of later thought, many passages found in the three Synoptics and accepted by most critics, merely, forsooth, because they seem to be in contradiction with the others? Christ speaks of the kingdom not only as something future and external, but as something actual and internal. The commission He gave to His apostles, the parables on the gradual growth of the kingdom, or on the delay of His *Parousia,* are inconsistent with the theory that His idea of the kingdom was purely eschatalogical. Were it impossible to reconcile these passages and many others with those which seem to announce that the advent of the kingdom is at hand, were we to admit with Loisy that some sayings of Christ have been misunderstood and disfigured, would it not be as logical to claim that the few texts on the mere coming of the kingdom do not come from Christ, but from the early Christians and the influence of Jewish ideas?

3. The many miracles related in the Gospels are divided by Loisy into two classes: those that can be explained naturally, such as the cures of various diseases, and those that would require a supernatural intervention, such as the raising of the dead, the multiplication of loaves, etc. Only those of the first series are historical; the others never took place. Now, both classes of miracles come to us with the same evidence and on the same authority; they were evidently believed to be facts by the Evangelists and their readers; they are naturally interwoven with the life of Jesus. On what grounds can we reject the testimony in one case and accept it in the other, except on the *a priori* and unscientific principle that a miracle is impossible, that "the idea of a miraculous intervention of God is philosophically inconceivable";[17] and that, "so far as human experience goes, no phenomenon ever happened in which it is possible to recognize a special and personal action of God, whether in the world or in history."[18] Is not this

[17] *Simples Réflexions,* p. 227.

[18] Ibid., p. 156.

tantamount to saying, in the words of Renan: "If the miraculous has any existence, then is our method detestable." [19]

4. According to Loisy, Christ's body was, like that of other criminals, thrown into the common ditch and never rose again; but His disciples in the course of time came to believe that He rose from the dead, and then, having gone back to Jerusalem, they organized themselves into a society; this was the beginning of Christianity. Is this a reasonable assumption? How could the disciples even think of the Resurrection of their Master, especially if He had never foretold it, and if His life and teachings were such as Loisy represents them to have been? Besides, he himself admits that all the Apostles, including St. Paul, believed they had seen and heard their Risen Lord. How could they have believed it unless the fact imposed itself upon their faith? How could they have had the boldness to preach the Resurrection at Jerusalem, and to point to the empty tomb as a proof? Loisy is driven to deny the historical character of the account of Christ's burial which is admitted by all critics. Why? Because of its close connexion with the Resurrection. Now this he rejects, not, however, on critical grounds; for, even granting that there are in the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection discrepancies which cannot be reconciled, does that throw doubt on the fact itself, which, as Loisy himself has to concede, was believed by all Christians a short time after the death of Jesus? The denial of the Resurrection comes from the *a priori* assumption that the return to life of a dead body is inconceivable.[20]

5. Again we read: "That Christ claimed that He was a divine person, that He was conscious of being God, made man, not only cannot be proved to be true, but can be proved to be false." [21] . . "He never pretended to be the manifestation of one who subsisted in God before revealing Himself to men." [22] "The dogma of Christ's divinity is only a symbol destined to

[19] *Vie de Jésus*, ed. 1867, p. V, IX.

[20] Letter to Mr. Bricout, 20 June, 1907.

[21] *Quelques lettres*, p. 148. [22] *Evangiles Synoptiques*, v. I, p. 408.

signify the relation which unites God with humanity personified in Jesus." [23] Hence passages which go beyond this, which affirm preëxistence or equality with the Father, are not, cannot be, the words of Christ, but only the expression of Christian faith of a later date. While he thus rejects the authority of those texts, he readily admits their traditional interpretation and grants that, in the words of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels, we find a claim to divinity, e. g. in the text on the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son, in the parable of the wicked husbandmen, in the claim to judge all men, in Christ's answer to His judges, etc.[24] In order to make Christ a mere man Loisy has to discard not only the testimony of the early Church, of the fourth Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles, but also a considerable portion of the Synoptics. His selection is arbitrary. He insists, and rightly so, on passages which show Jesus to be a man; but why does he repudiate the historical value of texts which show Him to be God, and which are accepted even by rationalistic critics, though they seek to explain them away? The teaching ascribed to Christ in the Synoptic Gospels concerning His Divinity does not go farther, in fact is less explicit, than the doctrine of St. Paul's Epistles,—a doctrine which is there given as the belief held by all Christians from the beginning.

If the life and teaching of Jesus were as they are represented in Loisy's books, it is clearly impossible to account for the existence and the faith of early Christianity as described in St. Paul's Epistles, the authenticity of which cannot be seriously questioned. There we find set forth unequivocally belief in Christ's Resurrection, in His Divinity, in the atonement wrought by His death, in His presence in the Holy Eucharist, etc. No reasonable explanation of that early faith of all Christians can be given unless Christ's life and teaching were such as we find them depicted by the Gospels in their present form. It is only by an arbitrary rejection of essential elements under the *a priori* principle that the miraculous cannot

[23] Ibid. [24] Ibid., I, 134, II, 609; *L'Évangile et l'Église*, p. 41 ff.

be historical, that the French critic finds in Christ only an ordinary man. Loisy is not unlike one who comes upon a magnificent cathedral, and, after breaking the columns, smashing the windows, defacing the paintings, wrecking the altars and, seeing only four walls and a roof left, solemnly declares the edifice to be a commonplace building.

Has, then, the Church in condemning him condemned scientific criticism, or hampered those who really are what he claimed to be, "sincere scientists and loyal servants of the Church"?

A. VIEBAN, S.S.

St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION.

ALTHOUGH the Incarnation of the Son of God is the central fact of all human history, and although Divine Providence had long been preparing the world for this important event, yet when it came to pass, the news of it was not flashed from one end of the world to the other. It took place in the secrecy of a little village of Galilee. An event compared with which the greatest facts of secular history pale into insignificance, was accomplished in the world without the world's knowing it. Nor is this all. When the Man-God, after thirty years of obscurity, began to do and to preach, He did not openly proclaim His identity, but left it to be inferred from His actions. Nay more, when the Apostles went forth to publish the glad tidings, they were slow in announcing the true nature of the Jesus they preached. And it was centuries later that the dogmas involved in the Incarnation were reduced to a systematic whole and embodied in the theological formulas of the Christian Church. It must be of some interest to the student of Christian apologetics to note the manner in which the doctrinal fact of the Incarnation was gradually revealed, first to the Apostles and then through them to their disciples and followers in the early Christian Church. We

shall see how, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the Church successively put forth her definitions as so many ramparts to safeguard this doctrine against the doubts and denials of scepticism and heresy.

Foreshadowings of the God-Man.

Before taking up the first point, let us cast a glance backward, and ascertain whether there had been in pre-Christian antiquity any anticipations of this dogma of a God-Man. Since Christianity is the final revelation of God to mankind, and since it is admirably adapted to the needs of human nature, we may expect that men would be groping after something similar to its tenets. And so we find in this instance. In the religions of Greece and Rome, the gods were deified men. The Persians considered their kings as incarnate gods. The supposed multiple incarnations of Buddha in India approached nearer to what occurred in the case of Christ than aught else produced by paganism. Among the ideas of philosophers, the Platonic Logos did more, perhaps, than any other to prepare the Grecian world of thought for the acceptance of the Incarnation. Since God is abstract, said Plato, He can do nothing of Himself. Hence when He would create or reveal, there is need of a Mediator, the Logos, God's Mind, God's Thought, the Agent of creation. The Platonists hesitated between two conceptions of the Logos. When they made him divine, they ceased to consider him personal; when they made him personal, they ceased to consider him divine.

It is among the Hebrews that we must seek the aurora that forecasted the coming morn. They were not left to grope by the light of unaided or even heavenly-helped reason. To them above all may be applied the saying of Tertullian that "God in previous history was training Himself for the Incarnation."

In the Old Testament we are told of a mysterious Being, called the Angel of the Lord. This "Angel" is at the same time distinct from and identical with the Deity. He says: "I am the God of Bethel" (Gen. 31:13), and also speaks

of God in the third person: "God says this," or "God will do that." All the early Fathers asserted that this "Angel" was the Son of God. Later Fathers claimed he was a creature through whom God manifested Himself. At any rate, God appeared in human form. In the later books of the Old Testament, Wisdom is described as born of God, distinct from God, and possessing all the divine attributes. Finally, the prediction of the future Messias, especially as understood in the time of David, when He was spoken of as an ideal king, distinct indeed from God, yet identified with Him and having divine prerogatives, certainly should have prepared the minds of the Jews for a Messias who is at at once God and Man. In fact, they did regard the Messias as far above any other creature, and even they freely ascribed to Him divine names, divine functions, and divine attributes.

The Advent.

This was all only a foreshadowing. The reality has come, and it far exceeds all that had been expected. Pagans and Jews had longed for One who would be man that men might be free to go to Him, and at the same time God that He might save us, and bring us to God and God to us. But they never imagined a God-Man in one Person. Jesus is a God-Man in one Person. And yet when He came, He could not proclaim Himself as such without exposing Himself to be misunderstood. With divine wisdom He planted the seed of this doctrine in the minds of men, and left to time and His own grace the maturing of the fruit. In studying the development of this dogma, we must distinguish not only two stages, but also two kinds of development. The one may be gathered from the pages of the New Testament, and consists of a progress in belief; the other is recorded in the history of Christian antiquity, and is a scientific exposition of the faith received from the Apostles.

When the public ministry of Jesus began, the Jews were warmly attached to a truth which long centuries of alternate blessings and trials had been required to establish firmly in

their minds, the truth that there is but one God. The Gentiles, on the contrary, had drifted farther and farther from monotheism until a plurality of gods was everywhere acknowledged. Jesus had to reveal His own Divinity and the Trinity in a way that would neither expose the Jews to lose their belief in the Unity of God, nor the pagans to retain their erroneous persuasion that there were many gods. Hence we behold Him insinuating these truths rather than plainly declaring them. He made claims that God alone could make, led men to treat Him as God, then to call Him God, and finally to reconcile His Divinity with God's Unity. To have done otherwise, to have spoken out and affirmed that He was God and yet distinct from the Father, would have been to estrange from Him His Jewish brethren, even those amongst them most ready for the Kingdom, since it would apparently have been to undermine the very foundation of their Religion, the Unity of God. He had first to make men His disciples, and after they had admitted His mission from God and His right to speak with authority, then, and not till then, to reveal to them a truth which they would now receive with willing ear, but which would formerly have seemed to them a hard saying.

The precise moment at which the Apostles and disciples first came to know that Jesus is God cannot be historically determined. Likely it was before His Passion, since then even His enemies understood Him to claim Divinity. Be that as it may, one thing is certain, namely, that before a word of the New Testament was written the faith in this mystery had been firmly established. All the Evangelists and Apostles clearly imply it, even when they do not teach it in so many words. But the same reasons that prevented Jesus during His lifetime from speaking unreservedly, also led to a certain reticence on their part. Hence we may distinguish three steps in their disclosing this dogma, the first represented by the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St. Peter and St. James; the second by St. Paul's Epistle and the Epistle to the Hebrews; the third by the Fourth Gospel.

MESSIANIC ECHOES IN THE GOSPELS AND EPISTLES.

In the first class, it is stated that Jesus was miraculously conceived; "And the angel said to her: Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. And Mary said to the angel: How shall this be done because I know not man? And the angel answering, said to her: The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore the Holy which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:30-35). "As His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 1:18). Next we are informed that He knows the Father perfectly, and that He is Himself perfectly known only by the Father: "No one knoweth the Son but the Father: neither doth any one know the Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal Him" (Matt. 11:27). In the formula of baptism, He places Himself on the same plane as the Father: "Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28:19). His Divinity, Preëxistence, Equality with the Father, and Eternity, though clearly implied in the claims which He makes and which none but God could make are not affirmed in explicit terms.

The second stage, as noted above, is represented by St. Paul's Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews. This order may seem strange to those critics who contend that St. Paul was dead before any of the Gospels was written. But it must be remembered that the Synoptic Gospels were written, not for believers alone, but also for unbelievers, and consequently it was needful to reveal the Divinity of Christ in the same way that Jesus had, rather implicitly than explicitly, and this for the same reasons that actuated Him in choosing His way. The Epistles of St. Paul, on the contrary, were addressed to Christians, and though they are not dogmatic treatises, he would naturally be freer to mention it incidentally.

And so Christ is described as the perfect Image of God, as

preëxisting, as the Agent of creation, as above the angels and by them to be adored: "He hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, in whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for in Him were all things created in heaven, and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominations or principalities or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him. And He is before all, and by Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the first born from the dead: that in all things He may hold the primacy: because in Him it hath well pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell: and through him to reconcile all things unto Himself, making peace through the blood of His cross, both as to the things on earth and the things that are in heaven" (Col. 1:13-20). I have quoted this passage somewhat at length because of the divine attributes it ascribes to Christ. He is the Image of the invisible God, the Father's Manifestation, His perfect, substantial Representation, since "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally" (Col. 2:9). He is the first-born of every creature, having existence before creation began. He is the exemplary, the efficient, and the final cause of all things, even of the angels: "In Him were all things created. . . . All things were created by Him and for Him." The Word Incarnate has the same relation to the Church that He had to the world before the Incarnation. Everything in the Church comes from Him. He is the First-fruits of those who rise from the dead. He has absolute supremacy in the Church as He had in the world. Hence He is the only and perfect Mediator.

There are also many other passages of similar import. I shall mention merely two of them, the second chapter of Philippians (verses 5-11), and the first three chapters of Hebrews, particularly the first six verses of the opening chapter. In the former of these, Christ is said to have been in the form of God, and hence to have had all the divine attributes, since the form of anything is the sum of the qualities

which make it what it is, and therefore the form of God is the sum of God's attributes, or is God Himself. In the latter, Christ is styled God's own Son, Heir of all things, the Agent of creation, the Brightness of God's glory, and the Figure of His substance. He is far above the angels because He is the Son of God, and hence the angels are commanded to adore Him.

In the Epistle to the Romans (9:5) St. Paul calls Christ God. He is speaking of the privileges of the Jews, "of whom," he adds, "is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things, God blessed for ever. Amen." But many contest the genuineness of this reading. Yet the probabilities are greatly in its favor. At any rate, St. Paul gives to Christ the attributes and worship of God.

The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple.

But the most luminous teaching on the question of Christ's Divinity is in St. John's Gospel. This Gospel was written for Christians, whilst the first three had been meant either primarily or at least secondarily for Jews or pagans. Hence St. John could speak unreservedly without danger of being misunderstood. In his very first chapter, he not only confers on Jesus the title of "the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father," but he also asserts His Divinity and Incarnation: "The Word was God," and "the Word was made flesh."

Then throughout his Gospel, and especially in chapters 5, 8, 10, he gives discourses wherein Jesus, without assuming the name of God, put forth claims which led, not only His followers, but even His unbelieving hearers to perceive that He professed Himself God: "No man hath ascended into heaven but he that descended from heaven, the Son of Man who is in heaven . . . God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son" (3:13, 16). "My Father worketh until now and I work. (Hereupon therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He did not only break the sabbath, but also said God was His Father, making Himself equal to

God.) As the Father raiseth up the dead and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom He will . . . that all men may honor the Son as they honor the Father" (5:17-23). "Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am" (8:58). "I and the Father are one" (10:30). "Philip, he that seeth Me, seeth the Father also. . . . Believe you not that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? Otherwise believe for the very works' sake . . . If any one love Me he will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our abode with him" (14:9-23).

Finally in one of his closing chapters, he tells how St. Thomas addressed Jesus as "My Lord and my God," and how Jesus accepted this title without any sign of disapproval. St. John then clearly teaches not only that Christ preëxisted but that He is God.

The Belief of the Early Church.

Before the last of the Apostles died, therefore, the early Christians had been unmistakably taught to believe in the Divinity of Jesus. This belief the great body of the faithful never lost. Of course, they were at the same time fully convinced that He was a Man. They had then exactly the same belief in regard to the Incarnation that we have to-day. Hence after the time of the Apostles, there could be no progress in faith. But there could be, and there was, a development in theology. Philosophic minds, especially of the Greco-Roman world, would inevitably sooner or later attempt to arrange the dogmas of Christianity, and in doing so they would bring out hidden truths hitherto unrecognized. But fallible men would on many vital questions disagree. Then it was that the Church would define which deduction was legitimate and which heretical.

The most palpable problem that confronted the philosophizing Christian of the infant Church was that of reconciling the two indisputable and seemingly incompatible facts, that the followers of Christ believed there was but one God, and that

they adored Christ as God. The easiest way out of the difficulty would be to deny any distinction between the Father and the Son, and in fact Praxeas, against whom Tertullian argued so forcibly, and a little later Sabellius and his followers, fell into this error. Their heresy, however, attacked the mystery of the Trinity, rather than that of the Incarnation. But even before their time, another false solution had been proposed. The Ebionites, representing the Jewish influence within the Church, asserted that Christ was not God, but only the Messias. Even some of the ante-Nicene Fathers, though bearing incontrovertible testimony to the faith of the early Church, denied the Eternity of the Son and His Equality with the Father. But it was with the Arians of the fourth century that the great attack upon Christ's Divinity came. They admitted that He was the highest of all creatures, "the first-born of every creature," as St. Paul had called Him, nay even of a nature similar to that of God. But since the Father was the only true God, and the Son was not the Father, the Son could not be God. This sophistical reasoning was so plausible that at one time almost one-fourth of the bishops of the Church allowed themselves to be blinded by it. The first general Council of Nice, after insisting strongly on the Divinity of Jesus, asserting Him to be "the only begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten, not made," defined that He is *consubstantial* with the Father. This word was leveled both at the Arians and at the Sabellians, since it affirms against the former that the Son is of the same nature as the Father, and against the latter that the Son is distinct from the Father, the prefix *con* implying a comparison between two or more.

Meanwhile other heretics had broached a view that would do away with the other element that goes to make up the mystery of the Incarnation, the Sacred Humanity of Christ. The Ebionites and Arians had denied that He was God; the Gnostics on the contrary denied that He was Man. Representing the pagan influence in the Church, and imbued with the prevalent philosophic idea that matter was essentially evil and that

God could not come in contact with it, they held that the Son of God assumed only the appearance of a body, not a real body. The early Fathers opposed them, and the Council of Nice reaffirmed against them the doctrine already formulated by St. John in his gospel, that the Son became Man. "Et Homo factus est." Later Apollinaris denied to Jesus perfect Manhood by asserting that He had a Body and an animal Soul, but not a rational Soul. His error was condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 381.

Theological Development.

Hitherto the Church had done little more than reassert what all Christians from the first had believed. The one exception was the word "consubstantial." With this term she inaugurates so to speak the theology of the Incarnation, by explaining that when St. John said the Word was God, he meant the Word had the same Divine Nature as the eternal Father. The conclusion now was that Christ is true God, consubstantial with the Father; and true Man having a Soul and Body like ours. But now thinking minds, accepting these two propositions as true, were about to inaugurate a discussion that would force the Church to take a new step forward, and bring to light latent truths heretofore the object of implicit faith only. The Church had just declared that Christ was really God and really Man. The question that naturally arose was: How are the Divinity and Humanity united in Christ? We all now know the true answer. In Christ there are two Natures, the one divine, the other human; and there is but one Person in Him and that one is divine. But the early Christians never thought of these matters. Hence when the question came up for discussion, though the vast majority of the theologians of the time, including the best and wisest, were on the right side, it was easy for even truly learned men to go wrong.

It was the heresy of Apollinaris who, as noted above, maintained that Christ had not a perfect human soul, that occasioned the first of these discussions. In opposing it, Diodorus

went too far. He not only held the Catholic doctrine that Christ is perfect Man, but in his anxiety to defend this position, he put forward the proposition that the Man Christ had a human personality distinct from that of the divine Word. His disciple Theodore of Mopsuestia elaborated his system. His great tenet was that Mary was not the Mother of God, but only of the man Jesus. The controversy thus engendered was just arising in Constantinople when Nestorius was consecrated Bishop of that See in 428, and he championed the side of Theodore so energetically as to give his name to that party. Meanwhile the defenders of orthodoxy had not been inactive. Cyril of Alexandria was the most prominent of them. Both he and Nestorius appealed to the Bishop of Rome. Pope Celestine I called on Nestorius to recant within ten days. But as he refused and as some of his brother-bishops still supported him, the third General Council was called to meet at Ephesus in 431. The Council anathematized any one who would not admit that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God, or who would deny that the Word of God is united to the Flesh "secundum hypostasim," substantially or personally. In the eighth century an attempt was made by two Spanish bishops to revive the heresy of Nestorius in a somewhat different form. They contended that Christ as Man was not the natural, but only the adopted Son of God. The logical and necessary sequel of this would be a denial either of the Divinity of Christ or of the personal union of the two natures in Him, earnestly combatted by Alcuin. It was condemned by local Spanish Councils. It never had any great influence in the Church at large, and hence it did not call for the intervention of the infallible ruling body, especially since it had already been reprobated at Ephesus.

As Nestorianism was the antitype of the heresy of Apollinaris, so Monophysism was the error of the extreme opponents of Nestorius. Eutyches not only denied duality of Person, but also duality of Nature in Christ. His followers did not all agree. Some said the human Nature was divinized, others that Christ was neither God nor man. The Council of

Chalcedon defined that the two Natures are distinct. Later the Monotholites taught there was only one Will in Christ. This would be to deny to Christ a complete human nature. Implicitly condemned at Chalcedon, they were anathematized in 680 by the second General Council of Constantinople.

Modern Theological Aspect.

Thus ended the development of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Errors have arisen in modern times, but to meet them, the Church has had but to reaffirm what she had for centuries been teaching her children. Hence it is unnecessary to trace the history of this doctrine down through the succeeding generations. More profitable will it be to sum up, by way of conclusion, the result of the discussions we have been reviewing. This result is embodied in the definition theologians formulate of the mystery of the Incarnation. They tell us that it is the Hypostatic or Personal Union of two Natures, the divine and the human, in the single Person of the Word, from which union there results one Christ. This definition includes the four main truths which as many different heresies in the early ages sought to undermine.

The Incarnation is a union because it is a combination of two elements to form a unit. It is a union of the Divine Nature and the Human Nature. These words are aimed at the Gnostics who denied Christ's Human Nature, and at the Arians who impugned His Divinity. Moreover the union of the two natures is Personal or Hypostatic. There are three kinds of union. An accidental or moral union is that wherein the elements are brought together by mere aggregation in such a way that they do not form one substance, but each retains its individuality. This is the union that exists between stones heaped together, between friends that have one heart and one soul. It is also the union which the Nestorians would predicate of the two natures in Christ. The second kind of union is substantial or natural. It is that wherein the elements lose their individuality, and they are fused into one nature. Thus are oxygen and hydrogen combined to form

water, the human soul and the human body to form man. Thus also the Eutychians maintained the Divine Nature and the Human were united in Christ.

The third kind of union is personal or hypostatic. It is that wherein two natures, whilst remaining complete and distinct, form but one person. This is the union, which, as the Church holds, exists between the two Natures in Christ. It is a union nowhere duplicated. It is a union, too, which we cannot fully understand. We cannot comprehend how a complete and independent rational nature should not be responsible for its own acts. Yet we see no contradiction herein. Rational nature and personality are not in all respects identical. The former is the principle of operation, the latter of responsibility. The responsibility for the actions of Christ's human Nature is assumed by the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. This is why there is no human personality in Christ although there is a complete Human Nature. This is also the reason why the definition says the Union is "in the one Person of the Word." This phrase shows, moreover, that the Human Nature is united, not to the Divine Nature, which is common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but to that which is peculiar to the Son, His Personality. Hence there are not two Christs but only one; for Jesus Christ is the Name neither of the Divine nor of the Human Nature, but of the Divine Person, the God-Man, the same Person who is the eternal Word of God, the one and only Deity.

In reviewing the history of this dogma, we cannot but admire the wonderful wisdom of God's Providence displayed therein. Far back in the shadowy ages that preceded the dawn of Christianity, we see a faint ray from the star of the Incarnation darting athwart the gloom that encircled even the chosen people. At the same time the best amongst the Gentiles were "feeling after" this truth, just as we see the most religiously minded amongst our separated brethren today drawing nearer and nearer to Catholic practices and beliefs. And when in the fulness of time the Word, who

"was in the beginning," and who "was God," "was made flesh," when God Himself came down from Heaven and dwelt amongst men, He did not dazzle them by a sudden revelation of His glory, but with a love that draweth sweetly and consumeth gently, He raised their minds slowly and mildly to the contemplation of this ennobling and soul-uplifting Mystery, just as we behold a boat between the locks in a river gradually and calmly elevated when the lower lock is closed.

Nor is the history of this dogma down through the centuries of Christianity a less marvelous manifestation of the directing presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church. We see the bark of Peter treading the narrow channel of truth, lined on either side with sharp crags menacing utter destruction. Surely if she avoids the rock of Gnosticism, she will be dashed to pieces on the opposite rock of Arianism, or if she escapes Nestorianism, she will be swallowed up in the whirlpool of Eutychianism. But no! her divine Pilot brings her safe through all perils. True, some of her passengers give her up as lost and desert her, only to be swept by a swift current far out into the black and raging sea of heresy and infidelity. And as the storm abates and the skies clear, the elect who have clung to her in the hour of darkness and peril, rejoice in the sunshine of the fuller knowledge of the Saviour, and with ever-increasing love for the Great Captain, they sail with her down the years of time towards the harbor of a safe eternity, fearing no tempests; for if the great heresies of the early centuries were powerless to destroy the Catholic Church, what has she to dread in Protestantism, Modernism, and anti-Christian Socialism?

Whilst the history of the development of the Incarnation increases our trust in the Catholic Church, it also deepens our devotion to the God-Man. The Incarnation is not only the keystone of the arch of Christian dogma, it is also the heart of Christian devotions. Admit the least of the errors that have arisen in regard to it, and immediately the Redemption, the sacramental system, and the Church have for us no more cohesion than the ruins of an old abbey, nay they crumble to

pieces and lie in dust at our feet. Without the full doctrine of the Incarnation, the Mediatorship of Jesus becomes meaningless and the efficacy of prayer little more than a hollow sound; devotion to Mary withers; the Holy Eucharist turns to an enigma, and the Christian can no longer cry aloud with joy that in every town or district where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, there lives a Man who is God.

A great gladness, therefore, it is to the heart gratefully to look backward and to study the stages whereby the darkness of pagan antiquity has been gradually replaced by our present noonday brightness of belief in the Incarnation; a greater gladness it is to dare to hope that a never-ending day is to dawn upon us when even our present light will seem darkness in comparison with its splendor, when faith shall cease and vision begin, when we shall rest entranced forevermore by the beauty of Jesus Christ, at once our Brother and our God.

J. P. SHIELDS.

Turtle Creek, Pa.

SHOULD WE PLEAD FOR A VERNACULAR LITURGY?

ACCUSTOMED from childhood to the use of Latin in our Liturgy, we are well disposed, when the period of reflection arrives, to accept the reasons ordinarily set forth for its retention, not merely as sufficient explanation of the fact, but also as decisive against the suggestion of a change. Those mysterious words which caught our ears the first Sunday we entered our parish church, seemed all the more potent for their mystery, and in keeping with the profound truths that were rooting in our minds; and their association with the subsequent development of our religious thought and feeling, at a time when impressions most easily give bent and direction to our lives, invests them in our minds with so much sacredness that at first we should be shocked to hear said that the same results might have been secured through the medium of some other tongue. On the other hand, if we approach the subject from an independent standpoint, as persons, let us suppose,

ignorant of the Church's history, and only lately become informed of her nature and aim, our first impression would be one of surprise that an organization chartered to enlighten and sanctify all races of mankind, should shroud its Liturgy, the expression of its Faith and life, in a language unknown to its members.

We are not obliged, however, to survey the question from either of these standpoints exclusively. We can appreciate the influence which the Latin, as being the language of our Liturgy, has, as a matter of fact, wielded in the formation of our religious character, without denying that our mother tongue could have exercised an influence equally great. On the other hand, a study of the Church's history will reveal both how naturally—one might perhaps say, inevitably—public worship throughout the Western Church assumed the speech of Old Rome, and what valid reasons there were why, having once been accepted as the official tongue of orthodoxy, it should not be lightly set aside at the call of ever-fluctuating race conditions.

While tempering our judgments, however, by these considerations, we may still inquire whether, in the present condition of the world, the Church might not enlarge her services to mankind by modifying her discipline so far as to give to, at least, the more widespread and permanent tongues the place which Latin now occupies in the Liturgy. My purpose in the present writing is to set forth some reasons why the change, despite certain strong *prima facie* arguments against it, would, as it seems to me, give freer movement to the Church's apostolic mission, and bring her children into more direct contact with the full stream of her divine life.

As will appear on slight reflection, any attempt of this kind will always be more largely concerned with answering difficulties brought against the suggested change, than with direct proof of its desirability; for, did not adventitious causes intervene to give pause to the course of one's judgment, no one, I think, could deny that a language understood by the worshipers would be the most serviceable in which to perform the rites of worship.

My attention has of late been drawn to this question by the influence which I have seen wielded over non-Catholics, especially those of the Church of England and her offsprings, by a Liturgy in their mother tongue. What struck me most was the steadying and controlling power of their devotional literature on the conduct even of those who professed no belief in revealed religion. I have known persons who would not give unqualified assent to any one article of the Creed, but who, nevertheless, spoke warmly of the beauty of their prayers and hymns, which they recited with evident feeling, and whose lives remained subject to Christian ideals mainly, as it seems to me, through that *consuetudo adorationis*, as St. Augustine would probably have called it, induced and preserved by the language of their liturgy.[1] But if the use of the mother tongue can give so much value to the ritual of the sects, how much more efficacious would it not be, if made the instrument of the Faith, truth, and covenanted graces of Christ's Church?

The grandeur as well as the beauty and pathos of our Liturgy are commonplaces of our own teaching, and are admitted even by many non-Catholics. We have in it a treasure rich beyond all human counting; we have the deposit of Faith embodied in it in a vital manner; we have in it the loftiest expressions of the Church's supernatural character, and of the sanctity to which she has given birth; and (what touches us more nearly) we have in it, already formed by the permanent needs of man, the language of the human heart in all its various attitudes of approach to God, from the most jubilant outbursts of divine praise to the lowliest cry for mercy and help. We have in it, too, a history of the Church's development, of the life she has lived, the forces she has been in contact with, and the struggles through which she has come

[1] In his Ennaration on Ps. 127, n. 7, the holy Doctor notes how servile fear, though it does not cause sinners to love justice, nevertheless forms in them a *habit of justice*, which makes the way easier to the love of God. *Timent quidem sed non amant justitiam. Cum autem per timorem continent se a peccato, fit consuetudo justitiae, et incipit quod durum erat amari, et dulcescit Deus.*

—the scars of battle and the laurels of victory, Calvary and Thabor—all is there. But while in itself our Liturgy is all this, and far more, so much cannot be claimed for it relatively to the people. Though no conditions with which the Church has had to deal could stay the progress of her mission, or render any instrument of her power altogether inefficacious, they have at times and in certain places been able to curtail the exercise of her natural functions, and to prevent the full realization of that ideal which her organization and aim suggest. And so it has happened in the case of the Liturgy: some shadows of earth seem to have fallen here, and to have lessened the splendor of the perfect light; so that, though we have entered into our inheritance, and have been taught by the Son of God Himself, nevertheless, in this one respect we are in a measure under the law of exile, and may not penetrate the cloud of smoke and fire which hangs over the sacred mount of worship.

That the faithful would draw large profit from immediate contact with the riches of our Liturgy is beyond all reasonable doubt. They would know from personal experience what they now hold mainly on the report of others. Besides, the exercise of worship would become a special means of education both of mind and heart, producing in its most natural form what the Church so much desiderates in the training of the young, viz. a blending of knowledge and piety in such manner as to nourish and develop their moral character without any reflex effort of their own. As being an act of devotion, it would, in addition to training the affections, convey to the mind the truths which it embodies concerning sacred and divine things more fruitfully than could any formal teaching, and would invest public worship with much of that subtle and wholesome influence which experience has recognized as peculiar to the Christian home. And this is an exceptionally important consideration; for one need not be a pessimist to see that our present social condition is unfortunate in this respect at least, viz. that it necessitates an enormous amount of formal religious teaching to compensate, as far as may be,

for the waning influence of the home, the school *par excellence* of informal, or implicit teaching. Our schools and pulpits are engrossed as they never were before with the problem of indoctrinating the young with the religion of Christ, for the burden of instruction has been so shifted that, unless it be borne by them, it will hardly be borne at all. But the wider one's experience of all this necessary and holy work, the more reason one has to deplore that at least the fundamental part of it cannot be more generally done by the informal method of home training. Now, whatever may be the root reason for home influence in general, one sufficient explanation of its predominance in religion is this, in the home religion is learned in the practice of it, whereas in all schools of formal teaching, instruction, as being primarily directed to the intellect, though of course it will have more or less bearing on conduct, has not necessarily any vital connexion with it. Hence the further we succeed in getting the constant agencies of religious teaching to operate along the lines of home training, the more confidently may we hope for lasting results. Now it seems to me that a Liturgy in the mother tongue would be educative after the manner of the home, of whose training it might be considered as an advanced department and an abiding complement. But if this view is just, an important increase of religious knowledge and improvement of religious fibre would beyond doubt be wrought in the Catholic masses, provided that in those countries in which Latin now obtains, the vernacular were substituted in the Mass, in the administration of the Sacraments, in the services of Holy Week, and in all other parts of public worship. The Church would feel again the freshness of her morning life; the congregation, drawn once more around the altar as in earlier days, before their part in the services passed to the acolyte and the choir, would share immediately in the supplications and prayers that are offered up on their behalf; and, being restored in some measure to their original place in the Liturgy, would give to it a clearer meaning and fuller harmony. Our big city churches with their distant wor-

shipers under the organ-loft and in the vestibule, who see little and hear less of what is doing, would give place to small parish churches, in which all would feel themselves full participants in the rites of the altar. The priest himself, being kept more distinctly conscious of his exposure to the intelligent observation of his people, and of his own office as mediator between them and God, would be further safeguarded against carelessness and perfunctoriness in his ministrations. It is hardly possible that priests of our day, were they surrounded by worshipers who understood the ritual language as did those who interfered with the wholesome innovation of St. Augustine, or detected Nestorius introducing heresy into public worship, could ever be found to recite, for instance, the *Confiteor*, the *Gloria*, or the *Credo*, with a precipitancy that withdraws them from the category not merely of prayer, but even of rational utterance.

A secondary, yet highly important, effect of worship in the mother tongue would be the store of sacred thoughts and words with which participation in the offices of the Church would enrich the minds of even the least instructed. Who can reflect without a feeling of regret that, whereas Protestants carry about in memory the psalms and hymns of their services, Catholics on the contrary, the heirs to the sanctity, the wisdom, and the learning of the ages, go out into the world possessed of scarcely a fragment of their Liturgy? No need to dwell on the extent of this loss. Priests experienced in missionary work well know how often the sinner owes his repentance to some words of encouragement or admonition which recurred in the devotions of his youth, and never entirely passed from his memory. They were not always efficacious in withholding him from sin, but they never allowed him false repose in his indulgences; they threatened or encouraged as the case might be, serving as a preacher where no other could find access, awakening memories, too, of his happier days, and of the sacred offices of maternal care; until, after struggling to his feet and falling perhaps a hundred times, they drew him on, through humiliation and gratitude, to the seat of mercy and complete repentance.

To say nothing of the rest, just think how far the services of Holy Week themselves, if conducted in the language of the people, would go to supply the want which I have just mentioned. Year after year the faithful gathered into the church by the subduing power of the Passion time, would hear all possible forms of divine appeal directed to their hearts in words so simple, so beautiful, and so persuasive, that some of it must perforce fasten itself in their memories. They would hear described, in language never rivaled by the tongue of man, the miseries come upon a favored people for their violation of God's commands: "The ways of Sion mourn, because there are none that come to the solemn feast: all her gates are broken down: her priests sigh: her virgins are in affliction, and she is oppressed with bitterness. . . . The child and the old man lie without on the ground: my virgins and my young men are fallen by the sword. . . . The tongue of the suckling child hath stuck to the roof of his mouth for thirst: the little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them;"—and would be touched by the recurring appeal which indicates their only remedy: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, be converted to the Lord thy God." They would hear the voice of God, grievously offended indeed, yet with a fatherly patience and love seeking to recall His ungrateful children to Himself: "O my people, what have I done to thee? or in what have I caused thee sorrow?" And again, the cry of the Saviour, voluntarily burdened with our sins, yet, as it might seem, appealing to us for mercy: "All ye that pass by the way, attend, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." They would follow Him step by step through the gloom of the Passion to the consummation on Golgotha, and would hear and understand the voice of the Church explaining the awful tragedy while depicting it. Then, after a little more, the language of joy and triumph would break upon them; the wail of Jeremias would be stilled before the rising notes of the *Exultet*, the humiliation of the Cross would give place to the glory of the Resurrection, and the language of the Church changing with the changed con-

ditions, would give expression to new thoughts, and reveal fresh beauties to her children. Who could come under such influence year after year without being chastened in heart and ennobled in mind, made strong in adversity and grateful in prosperity, as well as enriched with a store of hallowed speech that would remain with him a guide and delight throughout life?

It remains to consider the reasons why it is claimed that, notwithstanding all that may be said in favor of worship in the popular tongues, any interference with the present language of Liturgy is undesirable. Cardinal Capecelatro in his work on *Christian Doctrine*,[2] states the case for the retention of the Latin with a sobriety rarely met with in this discussion. While he thinks it not unlikely that the question may ere long come up in a general council, he confesses that for his own part he does not see his way to advocate a change. His most noteworthy reflections are contained under the following heads:

1. The call for a change is not so great, seeing that the faithful, when well instructed by the priest, understand the substance of the Mass, even when said in Latin; and besides, they can avail themselves of the translations, which are now in use, of different parts of the Liturgy.

2. The use of Latin in the Liturgy is a most efficacious means of maintaining the unity of tongue throughout the Church of the West.

3. It is a symbol of the unity of the Church, and a reminder of all that is oldest and most venerable in Christianity.

4. There is something mysterious and solemn about a Liturgy that speaks a language not used for the common needs of life, and not fully understood, which cannot fail to produce good results in well-disposed minds.

It will be noticed that the Cardinal admits the desirability of a wider knowledge of the Liturgy on the part of the faithful, but thinks that by instruction and the use of translations

[2] *La Dottrina Cattolica*, Vol. ii. cap. 15.

enough can be acquired to render a vernacular Liturgy unnecessary. Thus we are at once brought face to face with a call for special instructions to acquaint our people with the nature of our religious rites. Would it not be more effective and economical to put the Liturgy into the language of the people, and let it explain itself? The prayers employed in the administration of the Sacraments and in the Mass explain the ceremonies very well, and, if understood by the faithful, would remove the necessity of much of that formal instruction with which, as I have already observed, priests and teachers are burdened; and would make public worship itself a constant and fruitful teacher for all who practise it. Well-instructed Catholics will of course be better able than their less fortunate brethren to compensate themselves for their lack of Latin. But one of the most difficult problems before the Church—a problem that must have forced itself on the attention of Cardinal Capecelatro himself, as he looked out over his own diocese of Capua—is to adequately instruct, and keep instructed, the masses, many of whom either can not use books at all, or can use them only indifferently. Now one of the weightiest reasons in favor of a vernacular Liturgy is found precisely in its power of contributing toward this most necessary end, it being taken for granted that, in ordering her worship so as best to supply the needs of her lowliest children, the Church would be serving the interests of them all.

Further, the measures which the Cardinal thinks would obviate the difficulty, do not touch the heart of the question at all, the language of Liturgy, despite instruction and translations, remaining ever a dead language. As I intimated in a general way higher up, the chief advantage of public worship in the mother tongue is that, of itself, and without external aids, it brings the faithful into immediate contact with the Church's treasures of knowledge and piety; that it forms them in mind and heart without any effort of their own, except their sharing in the liturgical functions. Now the use of translations, though it adds to the worshiper's understanding of what is doing, does not substantially affect his relationship

with public worship. He is still, as far as language is concerned, sharing in it through a medium, and is not directly joining with the priest in the prayers that are being offered up in his name.

The second consideration I take to be based on the necessity of maintaining the Latin as the official language of the Church, the retention of it in the Liturgy being considered a most powerful means to that end. This is, and no doubt deserves to be, a favorite argument with those who are opposed to a change; but it is seldom stated with the same appreciation of its meaning as that shown by the Italian Cardinal, other writers being generally content to set forth the necessity of a Church that is one in doctrine and government having a language of its own, without making any distinction between the language of worship and the language of business.[3]

A governing organization as widespread as the Church undoubtedly facilitates the discharge of its business by the adoption of an official language. But if it is a question of preserving the official language of the Church, then I think the use of Latin in public worship has far less importance than is commonly attributed to it. Our Churches are schools of Latin only in the slightest measure. The fact that a priest answers the requirements of the Church in the exercise of public worship does not imply that he can hold intercourse in Latin with the Holy See. Nor will it avail to urge that, at any rate, the deeper knowledge of it which the ecclesiastical student acquires is owing to its being the language of Liturgy, since the exercise of the ministry is the goal to which his studies are directed. It certainly is the goal, but the ability to read the Latin of our Liturgy, though a necessary condition to it, is but a small item of the qualifications (else why six years of Seminary studies?), and of itself contributes little or nothing toward maintaining the official language of the Church. The student's first object, in taking up Latin, is to qualify

[3] Cf. Mgr. De Ségur, *Réponses à les Objections contre la Religion*, cap. 39; Father Taparelli, S.J., *Saggio Teoretico di Diritto Naturale*, Vol. II, note 127. Rohrbacher, tom. 41, liv. 65.

himself for his ecclesiastical studies, which, if they are to be pursued with profit, demand a genuine knowledge of that tongue. Our Church literature is essentially Latin, and cannot now be anything else; and whoever has a grasp of it that will admit him to the enjoyment of that literature, will be able to use it as a means of intercourse with others; whoever knows it only according to the demands of the Liturgy will not be able so to use it. It is the literature, therefore, of Western Christendom, and not its Liturgy, that must be pronounced a *medio efficacissimo* for the preservation of the official language of the Church.

The third consideration appeals directly to the heart. A memory of all that is oldest and most venerable in Christianity, possessed, too, of the other special charms named by the Cardinal, is surely something deserving a reverent treatment, something in fact whose title of occupancy one can scarcely undertake to analyze, without seeming to incur the guilt of sacrilege. But, as the task is before me, I would in the first place ask, to what percentage of the Catholics of Western Christendom does the Latin of the Liturgy appeal as it does to the poetic soul of Cardinal Capecelatro? How many of them find "in that Latin somewhat barbarous perhaps, and somewhat Greek, in that Latin born of the Faith, a perfume of sanctity, of beauty, of the robust youth of the primitive Church, which no other word, no other tongue, can adequately render?" [4]

To begin with, only those who have a respectable knowl-

[4] In justice to this appeal to antiquity I will give the Cardinal's own spirited words in full: "Non so se m'inganno, ma in quella liturgia così semplici e così primitiva, le parole, proprio come stanno colà, in quel latino forse un po' barbaro, e un po' Greco, in quel latino nato allora dalla fede, c'è un profumo della santità, della bellezza, della virile adolocenza della primitiva Chiesa, che niun' altra parola, niun' altra lingua può rendere appieno. Quelle parole io mi sono talvolta provato di dirle in italiano o in altra lingua. Non sono quelle: non ci fanno più vivere con gli Apostoli e coi santi che ci precidettero; non ci trasportino più come quelle nella Terra Sanctificata dalla vita, dai miracoli, dagl' insegnamenti e della morte di Cristo."

edge of Latin are touched at all by this view of the question; and of these many would be found lacking that sympathetic temperament and historic insight which would enable them to feel themselves, *in virtue of the Latin of the Liturgy*, living with the Apostles and Saints, and "transported into the land sanctified by the life, the miracles, and the teaching of Christ." It would probably be putting the figures too high to say that one in every five hundred, clergy included, would fill the conditions. But is it wise to keep four hundred and ninety-nine shut out in any degree from the fullest possible participation in public worship, in order that the five-hundredth may enjoy the special devotional flavor of our liturgical Latin?

So much is said on the assumption that the superiority which the Cardinal claims for Latin, as the language of devotion, over all other languages, is beyond doubt. But is it? If the user of it transports himself to the company of the Apostles and the scenes of Christ's ministry, we may be sure it is owing less to its historical connexion with either, than to the fact of his first having become acquainted with them through the Latin of the Vulgate and of the Fathers; and that one who from his boyhood had familiarized himself with the Gospel history through the language of the Douay version, would experience a corresponding pleasure in the words of an English Liturgy that recalled his early memories.

I think, too, that the loss which the Liturgy would suffer by translation into modern tongues is for the most part imaginary. I do not pretend to speak for the other languages, though I presume they are all capable of giving adequate and becoming expression to the religious thought of the people; but, as for the English, I am convinced it is possessed of a cadence and majesty that make it exceptionally well suited for the purpose of prayer. Readers can put this view to a ready and tolerably good test by turning the most striking Latin prayers into good English, and comparing their effects, before and after translation, on the ear and feelings, by reciting them aloud in both languages. Or, if any priest should wish to know whether the Mass would sound well in English,

let him repeat aloud, as if for a congregation who were following his words, the *Judica* and the prayer *Aufer.*[5]

One scarcely knows how to deal with the Cardinal's final reflection. Whether the mysterious influence of a language not used for the common needs of life, and not altogether understood, produces normal religious results, one finds it hard to decide. What may be the " far-off interest " of such influence, it were needless to speculate; but the immediate duty of instructing the minds of our people is hardly question of doubt.

The other writers whom I have mentioned higher up, however much they differ from Cardinal Capecelatro in the manner of presenting their opinions, are in substance one with him; and when they go beyond this common ground, their reasoning is weak and far-fetched. There is no need, therefore, to delay over De Ségur when he tells us that " the queen of languages ought to be the language of religion "; nor over Taparelli when, with utter gratuitousness, he informs us that " a Church that lasts till the end of time needs a language that traverses the ages without change " (i. e. a dead language); nor yet over Rohrbacher when, after supporting his view with more valid reasoning, he launches into mysticism, and reminds us that the confusion (i. e. the multiplication) of tongues was a punishment, and that the confusion ceased at Jerusalem, on Pentecost Day, when, " dans la même langue chaque peuple entendit la sienne." If the sick man heard the form and prayers of Extreme Unction in his own tongue, while the priest pronounces them over him in Latin, one could see the bearing of our author's words on the present discussion. But as the miracle of Pentecost was not made permanent, we are perforce thrown back on the natural means of intercourse with our fellow-men.

More deserving of notice is their claim that the use of a common language of worship creates a feeling of brotherhood

[5] Given a Liturgy in the vernacular, parts of the Mass would naturally be recited in a louder tone of voice than the present circumstances require, or the Rubrics call for.

among Catholics, and makes them at home in what country soever they enter a Catholic Church. The advantage here pointed out, however much it really is, is for the few who move abroad, not for the many who stay at home. But I suspect it is only another case of crediting to the language of Liturgy results which belong in great measure to another cause. On second thought all will, I think, agree that unity of rite is a more potent factor in fostering the feeling of brotherhood among Catholics of different nationalities than the unity of a liturgical language, unknown alike to them all. By way of illustration let us take two American Catholics who find themselves in Paris of a Sunday morning, and let us suppose that one drops into a Church in which Mass is being celebrated in French according to the Latin rite, while the other happens on a colony of Armenians, worshiping indeed in the Latin tongue, but according to their own rite. In the former case the duration of the different parts, the movements of the priest, and the ceremonies in general, would be the same as our American had been accustomed to, and he could take out his prayer-book and join in the service as easily as if he were in his native parish. In fact the guidance which the worshipers receive from the movements of the priest and the ceremonies is one reason why Mgr. De Ségur sees no need of Mass in the vernacular. In the latter case our visitor would recognize the sound of some words with which he had been made familiar at home, but their meaning would be as hidden to him as it was before, nor could they in their present setting offer him any guidance to the progress of the Mass; all else would be strange and puzzling. Need any one be told which of the two would feel the more at home?

The reasoning of these authors, strange to say, does not terminate in an attempt to establish the inexpediency of disturbing the present condition of our Liturgy; it tends further to create the impression that a dead language is to be preferred, for its own sake, as the language of public worship; and unless one were already informed from some other source, one might rise from them in the belief that Latin was chosen

as the language of Liturgy just because it was dead, as a check, it might seem, on the vain curiosity of the vulgar. Assuredly he would not be led to think that the present condition has grown upon the Church, and that Latin was first taken up in her worship precisely because it was the speech of the people.

Scholars are agreed that Greek was the liturgical language of Rome for the first two centuries; then, owing to the preponderance of the Latin element in the Christian community, it gave place to the Latin tongue. And the earliest Liturgical Formularies that have come down to us bear evidence on the face of them that they were composed at a time when the people understood them, and were closely associated with the priest and the sacred ministers in the rites of worship. Indeed there seems to have been little if any place left for private devotions in the early Christian services. The congregation joined directly in the prayers which the celebrant offered up in their name or on their behalf; they followed the lead of the deacon, or precentor, with their own words of supplication, as he presented their various petitions in litany form; and they listened to the lections from Holy Scripture which were read for their edification. We may be sure that the Church was not less zealous in Rome than in Jerusalem for the instruction of her children; but we are told in the *Peregrinatio Etheriae,* a writing of about the year 385, that in the latter city, owing to the presence in the congregation of Syrians who did not understand the Greek of the Liturgy, it was customary to repeat the lections for them in their own language. *Lectiones etiam quaecumque in ecclesia leguntur, quia necesse est grece legi, semper stat qui siriste interpretatur, propter populum, ut semper discant.* One thing at any rate is certain: the superior advantages of a dead language in public worship were not realized by our brethren of the first centuries. It is scarcely less certain that when Latin was substituted for Greek, both churchmen and statesmen hoped it would endure as a living tongue; and had it so endured, we may be sure we should now search in vain, in writers on Church government,

for reasons why the language of worship should be a dead language.

But the language, in the course of time, went the way of the Empire. It ceased to be spoken by the people, but survived among scholars and churchmen, and the Liturgy, becoming less and less subject to the shaping influences of congregational worship, lost the more readily many of the features of its popular origin, and finally hardened into the form in which it has reached us across the centuries. But it has not escaped the notice of the Church that this vast arsenal of the Faith, if made more accessible to the people, would furnish arms powerful and numerous for the new warfare of post-Reformation days. Hence the translations of various parts of it which have come into popular use. Is it too much to hope, in view of the Church's judicious readiness to modify her discipline to meet the changed conditions of men, that the movement already begun under her patronage for the opening up of the Liturgy to the masses is destined to terminate in the establishment of public worship in the mother tongues?—not necessarily in a restoration of the practices of our earliest Christian brethren, which in some respects might not suit our day, but of a condition in which the priest, when he lifts his voice before them as their spokesman and minister, will be understood by them without interpreter or comment?

Those who are disposed to be frightened by the difficulties to which an innovation may lend occasion, rather than to be encouraged by the substantial good it is expected to produce, will always find arguments in support of the *status quo*; but if the Church never undertook a reform until the prudence of her ancients was entirely satisfied, many a bright chapter in her history would never have been written.

Hence, when it is urged that to give the people a Liturgy in the vernacular would be to expose our doctrine to the danger of corruption, we know we are dealing with persons who are given to "borrowing trouble," as the saying has it. The vigilance of the living Church, to which the deposit of Faith has been confided, is surely sufficient guarantee against that danger.

So, too, when the connexion between heresy and the popular tongues, that is, the tendency of heresy toward a vernacular Liturgy, is pointed out, we may be sure it is only another expression of that same excessive caution and nervous dread. In fact this latter objection only raises the serious question, whether we are not here face to face with one of those cases in which the children of this world have proved themselves wiser than the children of light. It is lawful to learn from one's enemies, and the sects have had no small success, considering their handicap of a false religious system, in binding the people to their side; and without doubt their success has been owing in large measure to their mingling of religion and literature, or the adoption of the national tongues in their liturgies. Nor would it be the first time that Catholics have profited by the study of the enemy's tactics. We know how industriously the sects have calumniated the Church by misrepresenting her attitude toward Holy Scripture. Nevertheless, we should be blind to history, did we not realize that the marvelous activity of the " Reformers " in spreading the Scriptures broadcast in the popular tongues, drew her attention to a source of latent power within herself, and perhaps hastened the day when the promise of an indulgence would be for her own children a fresh incentive to the reading of the Gospels in the mother tongue.

While fixed at all times as to Faith and aim, the Church admits of considerable variety of method in the furtherance of her mission, owing partly to the human instrumentality through which she works, and partly to the changeful conditions of men to whom she ministers. Hence it was to be expected that at different periods of her history, different aspects of her nature would receive special emphasis. The world with which the vigorous mind of Gregory VII had to deal differed in important respects from that of our day. Parts of it had not outgrown the childhood of its civilization; the taint of barbarism still lingered in its blood; upheavals were frequent, and the national frontiers had not been fixed with the permanency of later times. It was a world on which it seemed

well that the lesson of the Church's unity and world-wide dominion should be impressed with all the aids of external form. Hence all that could be regarded as a symbol or expression of her magnificent regal power and centralized authority, might well be kept in the forefront, as a means of instructing and controlling the masses of people who had lately come under her tutelage. And so we can, perhaps, the more fully appreciate both the general policy of that great Pontiff, and his special efforts to restore the Roman rite to Spain and to preserve the Roman tongue in Bohemia.

But many changes have come since then. Europe has outgrown the simplicity of its child mind, and the disruption of Western Christendom, while curtailing the Church of much of her worldly splendor, brought men's minds to a closer study of her other aspects, and to a fuller realization of the character and source of her essential power. In the light of keen and prolonged study, they now more readily distinguish in her what is human and what divine, what temporary and what perennial, what dogmatic and what only disciplinary,—distinctions so clear to the Catholic mind of to-day, and so largely illustrated in the doings of the Church herself in recent times, that it need no longer be feared, as it seems to have been in St. Augustine's time, that an innovation in itself desirable might work harm by reason of its novelty.[6]

[6] Cardinal Gerdil (Opusc. iii. *De Plen. Potes. Epis.* etc.) thinks it was this danger that the Fathers of the Council of Trent had in mind when they refused to authorize the celebration of Mass in the vulgar tongue, further than custom had already established, *Noverant,* he writes, *pro sua sapientia Tridentini patres consuetudines, quae diuturno usu invaluerunt vix sine aliqua offensione, aut offensionis periculo, tentari posse, memores praeclarae Augustini sententiae, hoc ipsum quod utilitate juvat novitate saepe perturbare.*

The attitude of these bishops of three and a half centuries ago toward the question is deserving of special study. It did not seem to them expedient—they use no stronger word—that the Mass should everywhere be celebrated in the vulgar tongue; but they point out that it contains a large store of knowledge for the faithful, and by way of compensation, as it would seem, for the disadvantages of a dead liturgical tongue, they direct pastors and others having cure of souls, to expound frequently to the people something from what has been read in the Mass. *Etsi missa*

A further result has been to emphasize another aspect of the Church before the world, viz. her power to satisfy all the legitimate aspirations of the soul—to answer its inquiries and furnish its needs; and whatever serves to bring this truth closer to the minds of men must have a special value in extending her influence over their lives. Do my hopes deceive me in submitting, for the reason just pointed out, that our Liturgy, which, as I have already said, has a tongue for every condition of mankind, and a solace for the hearts of all, would be, were it cast into the language of the masses requiring spiritual help, one of the most efficient missionary agents the Church of to-day could employ? And if they do not, would not that fact alone be good reason why Pius might grant to Western Christendom in the twentieth century what Gregory saw fit to deny to Bohemia in the eleventh?

C. A. CAMPBELL.

Halifax, N. S., Canada.

magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expediri visum est Patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebreretur. Quamobrem . . . ne oves Christi esuriant, neve parvuli panem petant, et non sit qui frangat eis; mandat sancta synodus pastoribus, et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter intra missarum celebrationem . . . ex iis, quae in missa leguntur, aliquid exponant; atque intra cetera Sanctissimi hujus sacrificii mysterium aliquod declarent, diebus praesertim dominicis, et festis. (De Sac. Mis. c. viii.) If the Fathers of Trent were here to-day, to see for themselves how their directions as to readings from the Mass have been put into effect, they would likely conclude there was just one sure means of opening up that *magnam eruditionem* to the faithful, and that, considering the swing of thought in the intervening centuries, that means was no longer inexpedient.

THE BLINDNESS OF THE REVEREND DR. GRAY:*

OR

THE FINAL LAW.

CHAPTER VII.

RAPTURES AND REMORSE.

THERE are few spirits, who pass through life, if we except those who live under the dead weight of habitual depression, who do not experience at least a few times a kind of spiritual rapture or ecstasy that lifts them altogether out of the common ruts of existence, and places them on the summit of the everlasting hills. A certain poet has placed such raptures in the pathless woods, on the lonely shore, and even in the solitude where no voice of man breaks in to drown with its raucous whisperings the musical silence of Nature. The sick man who, leaving the heavily-laden atmosphere of his chamber, stretches forth his arms to the blue heavens, and drinks in long, deep draughts of sweet, cold air, knows what rapture means. The artist soul, who stands for the first time before a noble picture, is cognisant of it. The musician, who improvizes on his organ in the midst of imagined angel-presences, knows the exaltation. The poet, who has been suddenly smitten by a great thought, or to whose lips a great line has arisen, walks upon air for evermore, upheld by the serene exaltation that the consciousness of having created some undying beauty produces.

And yet, it is just possible that all these sudden, if serene, pleasures are nothing compared with the gentle happiness of a lonely student, who, cut away from the world, and in the sublime aloofness of intellectual exercises, bends over some mighty folio at midnight, and follows by the light of his lamp the magnificent processes of thought by which great theologians or philosophers cut their laborious and toilsome way through labyrinths of such vastness and intricacy that a faint mind refuses to follow, and perhaps leaves them in their search with a certain contempt

*This novel is copyrighted exclusively for the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, and will not appear in any other magazine in America, Great Britain or Australia.

for their persistency. It would be difficult to convince the outer world of Philistines of this. There appears to be a mutual and irreconcilable antagonism between theology and literature. Once and again a George Eliot may take up Petavius as an intellectual exercise, as a certain Irish Lord Chancellor used carry Tertullian with him on his holidays. And, with something like consternation the world heard of a Coventry Patmore taking up his gorgeous vellum, purple bound *Summa* in his old age to find there new and vaster material for an *Unknown Eros*. But there has been but one vast intellect, amidst the myriads, who wedded poetry to Philosophy and Theology, and entrained Aquinas and Aristotle in the service of the Muses; and that was the poet who stands alone and preëminent—Dante. But the man of letters looks up to the lonely watch-tower where the theologian is bending over his oak-bound, brass-clasped folio, and mutters: "A horned owlet, blinking his bleared eyes and flapping his cut wings by moonlight in a dismantled ruin"; and the theologian, looking down from his lofty eyrie on the "man of letters" mutters: "A popinjay with borrowed feathers, chirping some ribald chorus in the market-place." No one appears to understand that there is poetry—the very highest and most supernal poetic inspiration in these musty medieval folios; and no one appears to understand that underlying the music and magic of modern poetry there may be hidden some deep theological truths or untruths, which perhaps it would be not altogether unwise to learn or unlearn. But, whilst the contempt of moderns for what they are pleased to designate medievalism is a conceit bred from a sad and incurable ignorance, it must be admitted that theologians and high philosophers are not altogether wise in making their own sciences occult and unintelligible. The Catholic theologian is the richest merchant, but the poorest shopkeeper, in the world. He has countless riches, but he does not know how to use or display them. He has all kinds of antique and Oriental treasures, bales of costly goods, diamonds of Golconda, topazes of Persia, spoils and seizures from Greece, the flotsam and jetsam from all the wrecked argosies of ancient and modern times; but he does not know how to dress his shop window. He keeps his treasures like some vastly wealthy and usurious Jew in some secret bazaar in a white-walled and isolated city of the East. It takes a long time to travel thither; and men nowadays will not make pilgrimages after wis-

THE BLINDNESS OF THE REVEREND DR. GRAY:*

OR

THE FINAL LAW.

CHAPTER VII.

RAPTURES AND REMORSE.

THERE are few spirits, who pass through life, if we except those who live under the dead weight of habitual depression, who do not experience at least a few times a kind of spiritual rapture or ecstasy that lifts them altogether out of the common ruts of existence, and places them on the summit of the everlasting hills. A certain poet has placed such raptures in the pathless woods, on the lonely shore, and even in the solitude where no voice of man breaks in to drown with its raucous whisperings the musical silence of Nature. The sick man who, leaving the heavily-laden atmosphere of his chamber, stretches forth his arms to the blue heavens, and drinks in long, deep draughts of sweet, cold air, knows what rapture means. The artist soul, who stands for the first time before a noble picture, is cognisant of it. The musician, who improvizes on his organ in the midst of imagined angel-presences, knows the exaltation. The poet, who has been suddenly smitten by a great thought, or to whose lips a great line has arisen, walks upon air for evermore, upheld by the serene exaltation that the consciousness of having created some undying beauty produces.

And yet, it is just possible that all these sudden, if serene, pleasures are nothing compared with the gentle happiness of a lonely student, who, cut away from the world, and in the sublime aloofness of intellectual exercises, bends over some mighty folio at midnight, and follows by the light of his lamp the magnificent processes of thought by which great theologians or philosophers cut their laborious and toilsome way through labyrinths of such vastness and intricacy that a faint mind refuses to follow, and perhaps leaves them in their search with a certain contempt

*This novel is copyrighted exclusively for the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, and will not appear in any other magazine in America, Great Britain or Australia.

for their persistency. It would be difficult to convince the outer world of Philistines of this. There appears to be a mutual and irreconcilable antagonism between theology and literature. Once and again a George Eliot may take up Petavius as an intellectual exercise, as a certain Irish Lord Chancellor used carry Tertullian with him on his holidays. And, with something like consternation the world heard of a Coventry Patmore taking up his gorgeous vellum, purple bound *Summa* in his old age to find there new and vaster material for an *Unknown Eros*. But there has been but one vast intellect, amidst the myriads, who wedded poetry to Philosophy and Theology, and entrained Aquinas and Aristotle in the service of the Muses; and that was the poet who stands alone and preëminent—Dante. But the man of letters looks up to the lonely watch-tower where the theologian is bending over his oak-bound, brass-clasped folio, and mutters: "A horned owlet, blinking his bleared eyes and flapping his cut wings by moonlight in a dismantled ruin"; and the theologian, looking down from his lofty eyrie on the "man of letters" mutters: "A popinjay with borrowed feathers, chirping some ribald chorus in the market-place." No one appears to understand that there is poetry—the very highest and most supernal poetic inspiration in these musty medieval folios; and no one appears to understand that underlying the music and magic of modern poetry there may be hidden some deep theological truths or untruths, which perhaps it would be not altogether unwise to learn or unlearn. But, whilst the contempt of moderns for what they are pleased to designate medievalism is a conceit bred from a sad and incurable ignorance, it must be admitted that theologians and high philosophers are not altogether wise in making their own sciences occult and unintelligible. The Catholic theologian is the richest merchant, but the poorest shopkeeper, in the world. He has countless riches, but he does not know how to use or display them. He has all kinds of antique and Oriental treasures, bales of costly goods, diamonds of Golconda, topazes of Persia, spoils and seizures from Greece, the flotsam and jetsam from all the wrecked argosies of ancient and modern times; but he does not know how to dress his shop window. He keeps his treasures like some vastly wealthy and usurious Jew in some secret bazaar in a white-walled and isolated city of the East. It takes a long time to travel thither; and men nowadays will not make pilgrimages after wis-

dom. And then when you get there, you must have a magic password before you see the caves where are hidden the treasures that surpass the dreams of all the half-inspired writers of the world. Some day, one of those genii, better taught by the gods, will reveal, and place beneath the hands of men those spoils and treasures of the ages, as a Layard has laid bare the colossal sculptures of Nineveh, or a Huysmans in our own day has taught the world the meaning of the cryptic symbolism that underlies every plinth and capital, statue and gargoyle, stained-glass glories or twilight nooks, in Chartres Cathedral. For the present, however, these vast relics of medievalism are the exclusive right of lonely thinkers, who hold the possession, because alone capable of their usufruct; and these lonely students, keeping watch and ward over the strong-rooms and safes of Divine Thought, are few and far between.

One at least we know—the pastor of Doonvarragh. He had got the key of these treasures in the college where he studied; and he did not allow it to rust. For forty years, almost without intermission, he had given his evening hours to the study of theology and philosophy. There in that lonely room, which served as library and dining-room, he sat at his desk, night after night, some ponderous folio before him, his lamp or candles by his side; and there he plunged with all the raptures of a strong thinker into those reveries which haunted the brains of Spanish or Italian thinkers before the Crusaders set foot in Palestine, or the Moors had brought into Spain the works and the spirit of the most subtle mind that even Greece could produce. And, with the consciousness that he had done his duty to the sick and poor during the day, he had never a scruple of giving his nights to such intellectual revelry; and when his deep hall-clock tolled out the midnight hour, he could arise from his seat with an *O Altitudo!* on his lips, and seek fearlessly that slumber which he knew so well might be the prelude, as it was the presentment, of that deeper sleep, called Death.

But just as a patient who can lie only in one position may develop pneumonia, so this habit had produced in the mind of this man two dangerous maladies that were now well-nigh incurable. The one was a certain unavowed contempt for feeble thinkers or intellectual commoners. The other was a peculiar sensitiveness, through which every accident that interrupted the

splendid and silent harmony of these nocturnal studies jarred upon his nerves, and broke up the serenity that could alone render them pleasant and fruitful. Undoubtedly, much contact with the great minds of the world does beget some disdain for ordinary mortals; and it is slightly aggravating to be told by those who have acquired such habits and reputations that all things else are the toys of children, or the weapons of demons. But if an ordinary mortal ventures on the sacred precincts, and with all humility and bowed head tries to worship at the same shrines, he is instantly regarded as an intruder and a trespasser, and told to carry his incense and orisons to other temples. This, however, is but a human failing, the autocracy and conservatism that are generated by caste or genius.

The other consequence touches our story in a more intimate manner. Dr. William Gray, after forty years of solitary study, had become keenly intolerant of human intercourse. His nerves had become trained to such exquisite delicacy by silence and the solemn quiet of midnight hours, that he had become morbidly sensitive to anything that could break in upon his habits, or disturb that happy monotone of existence that had now become part and parcel of his life. But these things are not absolutely in one's own power, for we cannot control our circumstances; and sometimes the music of life jarred with sudden and discordant notes. For example, he found that just now in his sixty-third year his eyes were getting somewhat dim. Little clouds would come before them—tiny wisps of darkness, which he could not rub away. Again and again he had changed his spectacles to suit advancing years; but it seemed of no avail. For a time the dear old characters would come out clear and beautiful as ever, and then they would become cloudy and misty, and little aches and pains would shoot athwart his forehead and through his eyes; and he would rise up sad and disheartened to think, but not to read.

Then again, idle people, who seemed to have no particular business in life, would intrude upon his solitude; and with all his brusqueness and asperity, he could not shut the doors of his hospitality against them. But, as one of these visitors irreverently expressed it, "he was like a hen on a hot griddle," till he got rid of the unwelcome intruder. The tyranny of habit had made their presence intolerable. And the luxury of being alone, after such experiences, was all the more sweet.

This particular winter of which we write, he had been engrossed in a formidable and well-beloved treatise, the *De Legibus*[1] of Suarez. It was a gigantic folio, grimly bound in brown leather, and to an ordinary mind those seven hundred and fifty pages, each with its double column of close print, twelve or fourteen inches long, would be a solemn deterrent. Not so with Dr. William Gray. He reveled in these dry and forbidding abstractions,—Origin of Laws, natural, civil, and canonical; their force, their stringency, their solemnity; the abrogation, suspension or dispensation in laws; the rights of privilege and how far they extend; custom and the laws of nations, etc., etc.; and he enjoyed the subject because his own mind had a strange affinity with it. He knew nothing but Law; Law was to him the voice and outermost expression of the mind of the Eternal. He saw Law everywhere—in nature, in the human mind, in religion, in the comity of nations. He admitted no such thing as an infraction of a law, or a dispensation. Or, if such things were to be, they would by an infallible and inexorable sequence bring their punishment. He believed that the very slightest disobedience to the simplest decree of God or man had its condign retribution; he met every [illegible] pity, every justification for a broken commandment, by the one categorical and inflexible sentence: *It is the Law!*

He had ploughed half-way through this mighty labyrinth of human thought, when he plunged into the horrible indiscretion of inviting those boys to study Latin at his house. It was an impulse, a hasty, foolish act, done on the spur of the moment, and alas! with the not very exalted motive of angering his recalcitrant parishioners. Like all close thinkers he lacked imagination, which is the second factor in a sound judgment; and he did not realize what a hideous burden he had assumed until the two young Wycherlys broke in upon his conference with his curate. Then he began to realize what a torture it would be, if, night after night for months, he should have to close that beloved folio, and come down to the level of their intellects in grinding out *mensa, mensae,* and all the other pettinesses of the Latin Grammar. Once was bad enough. The boys were not stupid, but they found themselves in unexpected and unusual surroundings. The first lesson was not a success. Oh! if it would only

[1] On Laws.

end there. But now he had given his word; and he was too honorable a man to withdraw from an engagement he had voluntarily made. What was he to do? The thing could not be continued. That would be absolutely intolerable. He could not shift it over on his curate's shoulders. It would not be fair. And his curate might reasonably object. There was no loophole of escape from six months of treadmill work, night after night, at that abominable grammar; and with two lads, alien in every way, in religion, in habits, in prejudices and thoughts. He actually groaned aloud in sheer despair for what he had done.

But this was not all. The report of what he had done had spread from end to end of the parish, and was canvassed with suppressed, but intense, disapproval. It was unprecedented and, therefore, intolerable. When had he done anything for poor Catholic lads? What Catholic boy had he got into a situation that would help him and his family on in the world? He was always denouncing Protestantism; and now he opens his house to two Protestant lads to train them in those classical studies that were far beyond the reach of Catholic boys. Where was his consistency? Where his principle?

Such, but in many modified forms, were the questions now agitating his people, and discussed sometimes gently, sometimes angrily, sometimes with little reverential apologies and excuses, sometimes with bitterness and acerbity, in forge and workshop, in cabin and cottage, from end to end of the parish. The old people, as a rule, with all their tender reverence for the sacred character of the priesthood, and for their pastor in particular, for they regarded him always with a certain admiration blent with fear, defended his action, and attributed it to a lawful desire to acknowledge in that practical manner Dr. Wycherly's benevolence toward the poorer members of his flock. But the young, with all the fire and folly of youth, denounced the action of their parish priest with fury. They felt instinctively, and they were right, that it was an act of defiance and contempt toward his flock.

In no spot, however, in the three parishes was the matter so hotly discussed as in the cottage of the Duggans. They had been prime movers in the insubordination which emptied the schools. They had some old scores against their pastor; and with such people revenge often becomes a kind of religion.

"You may forgive," said one of that class, "but people of our position never forgive." They feel a kind of pride and glory in their vindictiveness. It is a remnant, like a cromlech or dolman, of that ancient Paganism that was so ruthless and uncompromising.

The family were gathered around the fireside one of these dark, gloomy, murky days that herald and accompany Christmastide in Ireland. The father was not an old man in appearance. He was well preserved, and seemed not more than fifty. There were three *boys*, ranging from twenty to thirty years of age. The vanithee was of the usual gentle but firm, patient, peaceful yet determined kind to be met with in every cabin in Ireland.

This evening, when the subject was again introduced, there was unusual bitterness in their comments. For that day, Dick Duggan, the eldest boy, a dark, silent, brooding character, had been ignominiously expelled from one of the fields now occupied by Kerins, the returned American. His cattle had strayed in through a broken fence and he had followed, when Kerins came on the scene. Kerins, who always boasted that he was a lineal descendant from the sea-rovers and freebooters who had given their name to the old castle down by the sea, was a strong, silent, determined character, who had seen life out on the American prairies, and looked more than once into the eye of a rifle or a revolver. He had made money; and yearned for a home near the ancestral castle. He had faced cowboys and Indians, and was not going to be frightened by a few cowards at home. He had furnished the cottage, laid in new machinery, borrowed a few men from the Defence Association; and last, not least, cleaned and oiled the "shooting irons" which had served him in good stead more than once in the Rockies and Sierras of the West.

When Duggan's cattle had strayed in through the open gap, Dick had followed lazily. He acted as if he had a kind of right over the place; and he was not too expeditious in stopping the trespass. He was rudely awakened by a stern voice hissing in his ear:

"Whose cattle are these? These yours?"

"Yes!" said Duggan. "They're mine. What have you to say to them?"

"Only this," said the other. "I'll give you three minutes

to put them out, and to follow them yourself. If you or them are on my grounds after three minutes, I'll blow you right into Hell!"

And suiting the action to the word, he drew out his six-shooter, and held it ready.

Dick obeyed in a sulky manner. Just as he had driven the last cow through the gap, Kerins said:

"You'd better close that gap. I'll not be quite so polite in future."

Dick Duggan's temper was therefore not quite normal when the discussion about his pastor arose around the turf-fire that night.

"There," said the old woman, "ye're bringing that up agen. What is it to ye what your priest does? Isn't he his own masther to do what he likes wid his own?"

"He is," sneered one of the boys. "But if he wishes to open a night-school for Prodestans, let them pay him his jues."

"Does the ould Doctor get his jues from ye, whin ye takes him up yere cows and horses to cure 'em; or does he charge the poor women who bring their babies on their breasts to relieve 'em and cure 'em?" said his mother.

"I'm not denying," said her husband, "that the ould Doctor is a good man to the poor. But what has that to do with the priesht taking up his sons and thraining 'em?"

"Wan good turn desarves another," said the old woman. "Ye can't be always gettin' an' never givin'. An' as ye haven't much to give yereselves, ye ought be obliged to yere priest to pay for ye!"

"Twasn't for us he done it, believe you me!" said Dick Duggan. "It was to aggrawate and annoy the people as if their hearts were not black enough agen him before!"

"Shpake for yereself, you cawbogue," replied the old woman angrily. "There's hunderds and thousans in the parish that 'ud die for their prieshts, thank God, still!"

"There's wan that'll die for him or for thim he's befrindin', high up too," said Dick savagely, as he went out of the door, "av he don't mend his ways."

"Look there now," said the good old woman, "there's the larning and agication he got; and there's what 'tis comin' to. The ignorant cawbogue, as if he dared lift his hand agen the Lord's anointed; he'd cling him to the ground."

There was the silence of terror in the cabin after this explosion. After a long pause, the old woman turned around from the fire and asked:

"What did he mane by saying 'thim he's befriendin'?"

"I suppose he manes the teacher," said one of the boys, "or perhaps Kerins. They had a couple of words to-day."

"Some say," said the old woman, prophetically, "the words will lade to blows; and the blows will ind badly for some. Faith, the wurruld is turning upside down, whin people can shpake that way about the ministers and messengers of God."

She busied around for some time, and then exclaimed, as the last faint peal of anger died away:

"Thim haythens below at the ould castle couldn't be worse."

It is quite probable that all this angry criticism and correspondingly zealous defence would never have come to the ears of the pastor, had he not his ancient mentoress and Sybil in old Betty Lane. She alone could dare tell him plain truths, which no one else could even hint at. And it was not very long until the opportunity offered. He was fond of visiting the old woman, partly for the relief and amusement her conversation afforded, partly for the edification which even his priestly spirit derived from her active and vivid faith. There was something actually refreshing to the soul of this severe and proud man in the childlike and simple and courageous manner in which this old saint addressed him.

"Well, Betty," he said, when the granddaughter had announced his presence, "and how are you getting on?"

Not a word of reply came from the lips of the old woman, as she stared silently before her.

"How are you this cold weather?" he shouted, fearing she had not heard him.

She was still silent, he watching her in surprise.

"Yerra, what's this I hear about you?" she said at length, in an angry tone of remonstrance.

"What have you heard, Betty?" he asked, somewhat nettled.

"That you're taking into your house these Prodestans and teaching them to be Prodestan ministers. Yerra, sure, the ind of the world must be near, an' Anti-Christ himsel' must be among us to make you do sich a thing as that."

"What harm is it, Betty?" he said, half-angry, half-amused at the interpretation put upon his action.

"What harrum?" she shouted. "Yerra, did I ever think I'd live to see the day whin a priesht would ask what harrum was there in making prachers and supers in the middle of his parish?"

"Who told you I was making preachers and supers?" he said, more indignant at the accusation than he pretended.

"Yerra, sure the whole parish have it," she said. "Be this and be that, I'd never have you in agin to say Mass for me, av I thought it was thrue."

"Very good," he said, taking up his hat, "I won't trouble you again. Good-bye! Nance, send for the curate, if your grandmother requires him. Don't send for me again!"

He was leaving the room in an angry mood, when he turned round to take a last look at the old woman.

From the poor sightless eyes, hot, scalding tears were running down the channels of her cheeks, unchecked and in silence. He thought it was grief for his recalcitrancy, and his pride was hurt that every ignorant creature in his parish should presume to judge him. He knew what strange fancies they sometimes entertained; how utterly wrong were their judgments sometimes. And yet, he also felt that perhaps after all in the eyes of All-Seeing Wisdom, the Catholic instinct of these poor people, intensified by prayer and the reception of the sacraments, and fortified by the glorious traditions of their race, might often penetrate more deeply into the truth of things than his own superior wisdom, where charity and justice were not always the guides.

He had turned away again, and gone down the road, fully determined to break away from such positive and ignorant questioners, when the granddaughter timidly called him back. She had been summoned peremptorily to the beside of her grandmother, who was heartbroken at the idea of being abandoned by her beloved priest.

"Tell him come back," she said, "and I'll go down on my binded knees to ax the Lord's and his pardon for having shpoken so to God's messenger. Quick, Nance, or I may die before he comes!"

He came back slowly and reluctantly, and entered the chamber. The old woman had risen up in bed, and was watching through her sightless eyes for the faintest indications of his presence.

When she knew he was near her, she broke out into passionate cries of sorrow and shame. He listened with bent head, and said nothing.

"You won't shpake to me," she said. "You won't forgive me?"

"Yes!" he said coldly. "I forgive you!"

"That's not what you'd say if you meant it!" she cried in anguish.

"Well, what am I to say, then?" he cried with some impatience.

"Nothin', nothin'," she said resignedly, and lay back on the pillow.

He left the room without a word.

CHAPTER VIII.

A Christmas Gift.

IT was Christmas Eve. As is so usual in Ireland, it was a dark, gloomy, rainy, tempestuous day; so dark that the priest had to approach the high window of his dining-room to read the office, for his sight was failing with age, and it was dusk or twilight in the room. The old housekeeper had put little sprigs of holly in the candlesticks on the mantelpiece, and in other little ways she had tried to mark the solemnity of the season. The gray, thoughtful, abstracted man recked not of such things at any time. He was above symbols. He saw only ideas. He only knew his own thoughts; and well he should have known them, for they haunted all his waking moments with a dread persistency of anxiety, or remorse, or apprehension. The approach of Christmas meant no happiness for him.

And just now he knew that to-morrow, the Feast of Love and Forgiveness and Christian Joy, many of his parishioners would come to Mass with bitter feelings against him in their hearts; and he guessed that they would show it by refusing to pay the Christmas offerings that are customary all over Ireland. This is the one act of high treason which marks the bitterest hostility between priest and people in Ireland. It is an act of apostasy, a flinging-down of the gauntlet, the ultimatum and declaration of hostilities.

He spent his midday in the church, hearing confessions, for, although his people feared him, they had perfect faith in him as a holy and prudent spiritual guide. He returned home just as the day was closing in; and at four o'clock the lamps were lighted and the curtains drawn for the night.

It was a fast-day, and he dined meagrely enough on a couple of fried eggs and a cup of coffee. The cloth was scarcely removed, when the single knock at the hall-door announced the advent of a beggar, or one of the many poor, generous, loving souls, who, on Christmas Eve in Ireland, show their love for the priest by little donations of turkeys, geese, etc. He well knew the pathos of it, the sacrifice they made out of their little gains and property, and the shy, sweet delicacy which always commanded the housekeeper:

"Say from a frind. Don't tell him my name."

But this knock came from Nance, old Betty Lane's granddaughter. She entered the room shyly, and looked at the priest with frightened reverence.

"I kem to ask your Reverence to say wan of your three Masses in the morning for me grandmother."

"Certainly," he said. "Let me see! I'll go over first in the morning and say my first Mass at the house—no! That would be awkward. I'll finish my two Masses in the church, and then drive over. It won't be too late?"

"Oh, no! yer Reverence. We'll be ready for you, an'—you'll take your Christmas breakfast at the house."

"Oh, no, no!" he cried. "This is altogether too much. By the way, how is Betty? I suppose she'll be saying that it is her last Christmas!"

"She is dead! yer Reverence!" replied the girl, turning aside and brushing away a tear.

"Dead?" he cried, horror-stricken.

"Yes, yer Reverence," she said. "Whin I wint in this morning to give her a drink, she was dead and cold. She must have died in the early part of the night."

"This is a great shock!" he said, striving to control his emotion. He remembered, alas! that he had parted from the faithful soul in anger, and unreconciled. Her old wrinkled face, with the furrows filled with tears, came up before him to torment him.

"Since the day yer Reverence was over," continued Nance,

not knowing what a bitter thing she was saying, "she hasn't been the same. Not a word could I get out of her but 'Yes!' or 'No!' and I used hear her sobbing at night in her sleep."

"But was she ailing particularly?" he asked. "Did she send for Father Liston?"

"Oh, yeh, no!" said Nance. "If she thought she was near her ind, she'd send for nobody but yer Reverence. But, sure, no wan can tell whin the ould people take it in their heads to go. But she was the good mother to me!"

And the girl wept sadly.

"Very good!" at length said the priest. "You can go home now, Nance; and I'll be over in the morning immediately after the Parish Mass. And we can talk over the arrangements for the funeral."

"Very well, yer Reverence. I'll lave it all in your hands. 'Twill be the lonesome Christmas for me!"

"And for me," he thought, as the door closed on the girl.

He sat down and buried his face in his hands. The keenest remorse flooded his soul. His oldest friend in the parish, his only friend, had passed away unreconciled and, as she thought, unforgiven. Her faith, her piety, her vision of God, her freedom of speech which he remembered now with a pang he himself had invited and enjoyed, her very poverty, out of which she gave so largely and generously—all came back, each with its little sting of remorse and bitterness for an opportunity lost, and not to be recalled. Minute after minute seemed to flit by over the head of the lonely man as he sat bowed by sorrow at his hearth-side. He did not hear the repeated knocks at his door—the shy, silent whispering in the hall, as messenger after messenger came in with her little offering. He could only think of that old withered face and the tears that ran in its channels.

At last the knocks had ceased, and tea was placed on the table, when the sound of a car stopped at the door woke him to a new sensation. Although slightly indifferent, and thinking it might be his curate coming for instructions for the morrow, it was yet a diversion from his gloomy thoughts. He waited and listened. There was a sharp, peremptory double knock, which his housekeeper answered. Then the sounds of something very heavy being dragged into the hall, a hasty colloquy and a loud-pitched musical voice, and, as the dining-room door opened, a young girl burst into the room.

She could not have been more than fourteen or fifteen years of age, but she had all the self-possession of a woman. And surely such a fair apparition never threw its shadow on that room before. Even with his dimmed eyes, the priest looking down on the pale face, just now washed by the wintry rains, and slightly flushed from the rudeness of the winds, discerned something strangely and weirdly beautiful beneath the hood that framed it; and large, dark eyes looked up at him with a half-solemn, half-merry look, that was to his lonely soul something wonderful and almost alarming.

"Here I am, Uncle, at last," she said, holding out one gloved hand, "ain't you glad to see me?"

He murmured something; but looked so surprised at the apparition that she thought it necessary to explain.

"You know I'm your niece," she said. "My poor mother was your sister, at least so I've been told; and Father Falvey said to me, 'Now you go right on; your uncle is a great man at the other side, and he will be awfully pleased to see you, and have you always with him.' But, do you know, Uncle, I didn't think you were so old. Mother always said that you were so much younger and she used talk about you so, and say how clever you were. My—what a lot of books! Sure, you don't read all these?"

"Well, you'll help me," he said. "But, child," he continued in a tone of real alarm, placing his hand on her head and shoulder, "you are drenched. Go at once to the kitchen and change everything and tell Anne to get you a cup of tea. Or, stay!"

He rang the bell. The old housekeeper appeared, half bewildered, half frightened. She thought she was going to get orders to expel the intruder at once.

"Take Miss O'Farrell to the kitchen fire, Anne, and get her some dry things to put on; and get her a hot drink at once."

"But I may come in, Uncle, then, may I not?"

"Certainly. I'll wait tea here for you. Only don't delay or you'll catch cold."

"Oh, I was near forgetting," she said, turning away, "would you mind, Uncle dear, settling with that driver? You know I think he was charging me a little more than was right."

She had put her hand in her pocket, and stretched forth her meagre purse. The little gesture touched him, and he put her hand aside.

"Now, leave all that to me! You go at once and change your clothes as I told you."

He came back to his fire, after settling her fare with the driver who grumbled badly and quoted the wet night, and the storm, and the eight-mile drive, and Christmas time, and many other things; but finally compromised for a glass of whiskey which the priest compassionately gave him. But, when the latter had reached his fireside, and the car had driven away, and all noises had subsided, and the wheels of thought began to revolve again, he almost laughed at the absurdity of the situation, and the strange pranks Destiny seemed to be playing with him. He was just in the condition of a drowning man who flings up his arms and goes down despairing into the depths, or of one who, clinging to some frail support above a precipice, at last decides that he must give way and succumb to Fate.

"It is quite clear now," he murmured, leaning his head on his hands, "that my peace of mind, if ever I possessed it, is at an end for ever."

And yet, he thought, how would it be if in his old age, with eyesight ever growing dimmer and dimmer, and with a heart-breaking farewell to his books on his lips,—if this sudden vision were to create a new dawn in his life, and supply by gentle human intercourse the awful dearth and hunger in his life which his beloved studies had hitherto filled?

"Perhaps so," he muttered, as his niece reëntered the room, "these things are disposed by the Higher Powers."

She looked more attractive even than when she had entered in her nun-like hood. The sodden wet aspect had disappeared; and she looked now so spruce, so neat, so perfect a little picture that the grim man decided, Yes, it was surely a new dawn that had broken on the dusk of his life! She had put on a soft grey gown, which fitted her form to perfection, her long, dark hair was filleted in front and caught behind with a gleaming comb, which allowed the loose tresses to hang down almost to her waist. Her large, open sleeves, frilled with lace, left her arms bare to the elbow. He did not approve of this; but he said in his own mind, It is an Americanism, I suppose, and her mother must have known it.

She came over quite familiarly and leant down over the fire, and in answer to his query, whether she had had a hot drink, she answered gaily:

"Yes, dear uncle, I had. That's a dear old soul—your help. But, look here, she's Anne, and I'm Anne also. How are you going to distinguish us? It would never do, you know, for us to be coming when we are not called."

"I'll call you Annie," he said. "Will that please you? It is a kind of diminutive, you know. Or, would you prefer Nan, or Annette?"

"Nan, Nan, Nan," she repeated, holding her hands in a meditative way before the fire. "Annette, Annette! No, we'll keep to Annie, I think."

"What—what," stammered the old priest, "did your mother call you?"

"Well, you see, I was away a good deal from mother at school; and then, when I did come home, she called me Anna. I didn't like it. It seemed a little tony, or affected. In school, I had a pet name. Girls have a fashion of giving pet names in school to each other."

"And what was your pet name?" he said.

"Gyp or Gypsy," she replied, "because I was dark, and, I suppose, a little unruly. You know, I have a temper of my own. I don't like being crossed sometimes."

"Oh, indeed!" he said, lapsing into his usual vein of sarcasm, "I'm glad you have mentioned it. We shall be on our guard."

"Ah, there now, that's sarcasm. Well, well, just think of a dear old priest, like you, being sarcastic. One of our priests at the Sacred Heart Church was very fond of talking in that way. You never knew when he was serious. In fact, he used boast that he never spoke seriously to the Sisters or the children. Well, you know, we used to laugh—people always laugh at such witty things, especially when they are said about others; but somehow, we didn't like him. You know," she said, shuffling uneasily, and spreading out her little hands deprecatingly, "we expect priests to be serious, and gentle, and—and—awful."

"Very good," he cried, rising and going to the tea-table, "after that little lecture to your venerable uncle, suppose we have some tea."

She drew over her chair, and said saucily, as she removed the cosey:

"I think, uncle, 'tis my place to pour out the tea, is it not?"

"I suppose so," he said, resigning himself to the new order of

things. "I take it that you are going to take possession of all my goods and chattels."

"There now again," she cried, raising the teapot daintily, "where did you learn to be sarcastic, uncle, living all alone here by yourself? Why, that only belongs to society people."

"Oh, well," he replied, "we don't give society people a monopoly of such things. When you begin to think, and you must think a good deal when you are alone, you naturally come to take a rather cynical view of things."

"Well, now," she said, "that is right curious. But, uncle?"

"Well?" he said.

"Do you know I have had no dinner to-day. May I not order an egg?"

"'Tis a fast-day, Annie," he said. "And the laws of the Church have never been violated in this house."

The girl looked disappointed. He saw it, and relented.

"Ha, you said, I believe, that you had no dinner?"

"No, absolutely nothing since I left the boat at Queenstown at noon. And say, uncle, I'm not bound to fast, you know, I am scarcely fifteen as yet."

"No," he said, rising and touching the bell, "but you are bound to abstain. Every child over seven years is bound to abstain."

"My! but that is hard," said his niece, nibbling at a piece of toast. "Over with us, we got a dispensation easily in this matter. Don't you give dispensations here?"

"No!" he said, she thought rather sharply. "Law is Law. It is made to be obeyed, not to be dispensed with. Anne," he said, turning to his aged housekeeper, "Miss O'Farrell has had no dinner to-day. This must be her dinner. Can you get some eggs and sardines?"

"I can, sir," said the old housekeeper readily. "But may not the child have a chop after so long a fast?"

"No!" he said, so sharply that Annie was startled. It was a new revelation.

He seemed to be moody for some time. The eggs and sardines on toast presently appeared, and the girl raised the cover.

"They *are* nice," she said, with the enthusiasm of hunger. "Uncle, may I not help you to some?"

"Have I not told you," he said, almost rudely, "that this is a fast day? How then can you ask me to violate one of the laws of the Church?"

She sank abashed before his eyes, and ate her meal in silence. He had pulled over his chair to the fire, leaving his niece alone at the table. He had simply swallowed one cup of tea, touching no food.

During the progress of the meal he touched the bell again, and when the old housekeeper appeared he asked whether Miss O'Farrell's room had been got ready. The old woman answered, yes.

"Then, be sure to have a good peat and wood fire there," he said. "Miss O'Farrell is used to a heated room."

This softened matters again a little, and the girl crept near him.

"Uncle?" she said timidly.

"Well?" he replied, but there was an accent of kindness in his voice.

"Uncle, will you call me 'Annie' always and not 'Miss O'Farrell'?"

"Very well," he replied.

"Uncle?" she said again.

"Well, what now?" he said.

"Do you know," she said, laying her small hand on his shoulder, "I am afraid that—that—you didn't expect me—that I am unwelcome."

"No, no, Annie," he replied, taking the girl's hand from his shoulder, and folding it in his big palm. "You mustn't think that. You must learn to bear with the temper of an old man. You are thrice welcome for your own sake, and—and for your mother's. There; we'll say no more to-night. Be ready to come with me in the morning to eight-o'clock Mass. Anne will call you. Good-night!"

"Good-night!" she said. "And, uncle?"

"Well now?" he asked.

"A Happy Christmas, uncle!"

"Yes, yes, a Happy Christmas!" he said. Then, as if he were again too hasty, he added:

"A Happy Christmas, Annie!"

CHAPTER IX.

A Question in Theology.

TO sensitive, nervous dispositions, which are always regretting the past, or filled with forebodings for the future, the first moments of waking in the morning are very trying. Consciousness suddenly aroused seems to rivet and fasten itself on the most unpleasant things; and it is only when the blood begins to circulate freely through the brain, that these unhallowed thoughts are expelled, and the more healthy ideas of normal waking hours promptly take their place.

In the gray dawn of the winter morning the good pastor of whom we are writing suddenly realized two or three portentous events, which in the excitement of the previous night, and the happy oblivion of sleep, he had momentarily forgotten. All the remorse he had felt the previous day on the announcement of the death of old Betty Lane, came back and he felt abashed, humbled, ashamed. All the dread of his first interview with his niece came back; and he was terrified. Evils seemed to be accumulating on him from all sides; and the more he sought to shelter himself against them, the more surely and swiftly did they seek him out.

It was a silent and moody man that drove his niece across the level road that led to his church; and to her young eyes, cleared from the night-shadows, he seemed quite a different being from the stately and stern, but kindly being she had met the night before. He led her around by a private door that marked the entrance to the pews: and probably it was this little preoccupation and his dim sight that prevented him from observing that not far away from the place where his own collectors were sitting with sheets of paper before them, there was a small group of two or three men, the center of which was Dick Duggan. Their object in placing themselves there was manifest. They said nothing, did nothing, but watched. And the result was soon seen. Men came into the chapel-yard, made their way toward the collectors to pay their little offerings and have their names taken down, saw this group watching silently, paused, hesitated, and passed by without entering their names. Little knots of people came in, eagerly talking, suddenly grew silent, whispered in a

frightened tone, drew back, and passed into the church, like the others. The collectors looked serious: the little group of watchers smiled; Duggan laughed outright.

It was rather fortunate the parish priest had not observed them. With his lofty pride, he disdained going near the collectors to ask or see if the parishioners were paying their usual offerings. This happy accident left him in ignorance of the proceedings of the men who were exercising a silent terrorism over the people. If he had seen them, he would have peremptorily ordered them from the place; and if they resisted, he would have removed them with violence. But, although he suspected that there would be some conspiracy on foot to compel the people to withhold their Christmas offerings, he never dreamed that they would venture on such a bold and insolent plan to thwart and annoy him. It was only after he had said his second Mass, and was hurrying over toward where the remains of old Betty Lane were lying, that he was accosted by the collectors, who showed him a vacant list and an empty purse. He thanked them, and said nothing, but passed on.

He left his niece at his house, and bade her have breakfast without waiting for him, and drove on to where the remains of the old woman awaited their final sepulture. There in the presence of the saintly dead, he saw as in a flash of inspiration, how poor and petty were all earthly things, when viewed in the light of that eternity to which Death was the happy portal; and not for the first, nor the hundredth, time in his life, did he wish that his weary pilgrimage, too, were at an end, and that he could get away from these hateful and perplexing surroundings into the unbroken serenity of eternity. He breakfasted there in that little parlor with that poor, humble washerwoman; and watching her patient face, seamed with toil and the harsh buffetings of life, he grew calmer, and more confident of God.

"I shall miss poor Betty," he said. "She was almost my only friend in the parish."

"Oh, don't say that, yer reverence," said the poor girl, "you have plinty of frinds; only they're shy of you."

"The collection this morning doesn't show it," he said, almost humbly. "Look here, Nance, not a name on the list."

"Glory be to God!" said the frightened girl, "that never happened before. There must be some divilment behind it."

"I don't mind the loss," he said. "That's nothing. It is the shame and insult of the thing I mind. Every man that passed by this morning slapped me on the face."

"It's only wan or two, yer reverence," she said, reassuringly. "Only wan or two; but they are a bad lot, and the people are afraid of them."

"That's just it," he said. "That's just what I complain of —that the whole parish should be terrorized by one or two miscreants. What are they afraid of? What can these fellows do?"

"That's thrue, yer reverence," she said. "But you see the people nowadays don't like throuble; an' anny wan of them blagards could set fire to a rick of hay or straw, or burn down the cow-house, or lame a horse for life—and they'd do it!"

"Very good," said the priest. "But then the people would get compensation from the court. They wouldn't suffer a penny loss."

"Yes, yer reverence. But look at all the throuble. Look at the lawyers, witnesses; and maybe afther they'd gone to all kinds of expinse, it would be thrun out in the ind by the ould barrister."

"I see," he said, reflectively. "You're right, Nance! The days of heroism, and even decent principle, are past. The people are become a parcel of sheep, ready to fly and destroy themselves at the bark of a dog."

"At any rate, yer reverence," she said, "there's wan consolation. They're more afraid of Dick Duggan than they are of yer reverence."

"I'm afraid 'tis true," he said laughing. "They can't say any more that I am keeping them in a state of terror."

"But, you may be sure of wan thing, yer reverence," the poor girl said, anxious to relieve the weary load that was pressing on her pastor, "there isn't wan parishioner, except maybe thim Duggans, that won't pay you yer jues. An' if the poor old 'uman had her way, you'd get it on the double."

"Yes, I know that," he said somewhat more cheerily. "But not one penny of their money shall soil my hands. I wouldn't touch the coins of cowards."

It was true. That very day, at the funeral of old Betty Lane, whilst the men were waiting to take out the coffin for burial some

farmers came up sheepishly to the parish priest, and proffered their offerings.

"We weren't able to give it this morning," they said.

"Why?" he asked shortly, whilst his thin lips drew together, and curled in angry scorn.

There was no answer.

"Take your money," he said. "I'd feel myself everlastingly shamed, if I touched the money of men who were afraid to do right."

And they slunk away.

Again, after the funeral was over, little groups met him; and humbly and apologetically offered their little mites. He dismissed every one of them with contempt; and they began to think that after all, they would have done better had they braved the anger of Dick Duggan and his clique.

He got home in the early afternoon, and ashamed of the gloom of the morning, which he saw had fallen heavy on his niece, he determined at any cost to put a brave face on matters and help Annie and his only other guest, his curate, to have a pleasant evening.

When he entered the hall, and put up his driving cloak and hat, Annie came out to meet him. It was quite clear that the morning's depression had left but little trace on her blithe and happy spirit, for she had her arms bare to the elbows and whitened with flour, whilst thick lumps of dough clung to her fingers.

"You never wished me a 'Merry Christmas' this morning," she said. "And now I can't shake hands with you. I am making up some jam-rolls for Anne. She says she never saw them made."

"Then you'll have to eat them yourself," he said. "Neither I nor my curate is going to put ourselves in for a bad fit of dyspepsia."

"But, uncle! Dyspepsia?" she cried in protest. "No! No! I'll make them so light you won't know when you've swallowed them. I will, indeed."

"All right," he said. "But we don't want any of your American cookery here. Keep your old pies and doughnuts to yourselves. All we want is honest Irish meat and drink."

"Well, I'll bet you,—I'll bet you, something," she cried, "that I'll make your curate eat them. Who is he? And what is he like?"

"Ah, well, now, just wait and see. It is always a mistake to describe people. There is generally disappointment. But get away now and go to work. I have to read my office before dinner, and read up something. I suppose there can be no reading to-night."

"I guess not," she said, "if I can help it. Imagine—reading on Christmas Night!"

Father Henry Liston came over early. His face was clouded. He had heard of the news at Doonvarragh, although at Lackagh and Athboy, where he had celebrated, the collections came in as usual.

"You see, Pastor," he said, with some freedom, because he felt he was now on the pastor's side, and there was almost a sense of patronage in his accent, "if you had just allowed me pitch into those scoundrels, this would never have happened. These fellows begin to think we are afraid of them; and, by Jove, mark my words, Pastor, if ever our people think that we fear them, they will trample upon us. That's my experience."

Dr. William Gray looked down on the youthful form and boyish face of his curate, and smiled.

"Now, if I had been over here this morning," continued Henry, not noticing his pastor's amusement, "I'd have taken that Duggan by the nape of the neck, and pitched him into the channel. And, then, I'd have taken each of the other fellows in turn, and chucked them out."

"You wouldn't have taken the three in a bunch?" said the pastor. "That would have spared time and labor."

"No," said his curate, unheeding the sarcasm in his anger, "I would have taken them separately and individually. It would have been more effective; and then, I'd have withered up that congregation in such a way that not one of them would have been left an appetite for roast goose that day."

"That would never do," said his pastor. "That would drive the whole parish to drink; and the remedy would be worse than the disease."

"Well, all I know is," said the curate, "you have taken the whole thing too quietly. You have the name of being a strong man; and I suppose you were when you were young. But age, age tells its own tale. It is only young men should be made

Parish Priests and Bishops. They have no experience and no fear."

"Out of the lips of babes and sucklings cometh forth wisdom," said his pastor. "But we'll waive the subject now, young man. I want to ask you a question in theology before we dine. I believe we can't discuss the matter after."

The curate's face fell at the word "Theology." It was the prelude, he knew, to many an ordeal. But he plucked up courage to say:

"Why not?"

"No matter. You'll see for yourself after," replied his pastor. "But the question is, If a parcel were sent to you from abroad, a parcel which you strenuously objected to, which you didn't want, and distinctly refused, were yet sent on, what would you do?"

Henry reflected a moment, and recalled all his principles of justice and contracts, which he had learned with infinite pains in college. Then he held up his head and did a wise thing. He asked another question:

"Was the carriage prepaid?"

"Well, yes," said the pastor. "They were obliging and polite enough to do that."

"Because, you know," said his curate, confidently, "I always suspect unstamped letters, or parcels on which you are requested to pay something. Well, then, I should say it all depends on the value of the parcel."

"But, you don't know the value and cannot measure it. It may be worth a good deal, or —"

Here the pastor paused. He could not say that word.

"By Jove, that's a hard case," said Henry, driving his hands deep in his pockets and looking crossly at his boots. "I never heard of such a case in theology. It only shows that in practical life, questions will crop up, of which the astutest theologians never dreamed. You must give me time, Pastor; that's not a question to be decided offhand."

"Certainly," said his pastor. "In fact here comes dinner. You sit here."

"You expect somebody else," said his curate, nodding to the knife and fork and napkin at the other side.

"Yes! This is my niece, Miss O'Farrell, Father Liston," said

the pastor, as Annie entered the room. And probably, the best fun of that Christmas night was to see the astonishment and surprise written on the face of that good curate, as Annie sailed in, and quietly saluted him.

She had put on a white dress, frilled and tucked and plaited in some marvellous manner. Little fringes of lace fluttered around her neck and over her hands; and a little minature of her mother's clasped at her throat seemed to be the only bit of color that relieved the white monotone of dress on the one hand, and the dark masses of hair that rippled down from the gold fillet across her neck. She looked to the eyes of the young priest the living embodiment of all those pure, sweet, holy figures that had been painted on his brain, since he took up his first prayer-book, or raised his eyes, at the bidding of his mother, to the celestial vision of the Woman and Child. He stared and stared and stared, as if he were mesmerized with surprise, until he was brought back to his senses by the young lady herself saying:

"Look here, Father Liston, you're spilling your soup on the table cloth; and Anne will be furious."

Then he blushed for his bad manners, and got back to his senses.

But it was a happy dinner; and when the plum-pudding and jam-rolls and mince-pies came round, Henry did them all full justice.

"You'll take some more plum-pudding?" said the pastor.

"For the sake of the sauce," said Henry, handing up his plate.

"No, no, Uncle," said Annie, "Father Liston must take some of these jam-rolls. It was I made them."

There was no resisting that appeal; and Henry took three jam-rolls on his plate.

"They are as light as feathers!" said Annie.

"They are absolutely murderous!" said her uncle.

"I appeal to Father Liston," said Annie.

"Yes! they're very bad," said Henry. "Don't give any to your uncle, Miss O'Farrell. They'd shorten his life. Keep them all for me."

"There, I guessed so much," said the pastor.

"You might as well eat bullets," said Henry, handing over his plate for more. "They're certainly as indigestible as cheese upon corned beef."

"You'll be deadly sick to-morrow," said the pastor, "and I'll not attend your calls."

"All right," said Henry. "I wouldn't advise you touch one, Pastor. You'd be a dead man in a week."

And then the dish was cleared. Annie held it up triumphantly over her head. "There's American cookery," she cried. "Hurrah for the Stars and Stripes!"

Then she said merrily that the sauce of the pudding had got into her head and that, if she stayed longer, she would talk too much, and would uncle mind, if she went in to Anne; and she would appear again at tea-time. Which was all a pretty way of contriving to leave the two priests alone, for they had many deep things to discuss which a young maiden's comprehension could hardly reach.

When he had closed the door, Henry said, standing near the fire:

"Is that the parcel you spoke of, Pastor, that came prepaid from a foreign land?"

"It is," said the Pastor, as just a little shade of anxiety crept down on his face.

"Then I think my decision is, to keep that parcel," said Henry.

P. A. SHEEHAN.

Doneraile, Ireland.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Analecta.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

1. NON POTEST PERMITTI MISSAE CELEBRATIO IN SACELLIS COEMETERIORUM, IN QUIBUS NON HABETUR PRAESCRIPTA DISTANTIA ALTARIUM A LOCULIS.
2. ALTARIA MOBILIA EX LIGNO CONFECTA CUM LAPIDE CONSECRATO IN MEDIO TOLLERARI POSSUNT, DUMMODO MENSA SOLIDIS BASIBUS ADHAEREAT, ET ALTARE IN UNO LOCO STABILITER COLLOCETUR.

R.mus D.nus Caietanus Muller, Episcopus Gallipolitanus, a sacrae Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutionem reverenter expostulavit, nimirum:

In sepulcreto civitatis Gallipolitanae tum confraternitates tum privatae familiae habent sua sacella, in quibus cadavera sepeliuntur in loculis. At huiusmodi sacella valde exigua sunt et angusta, ita ut vix aliquod eorum habeat quatuor metra longitudinis, tria vero latitudinis; altaria autem non distant in eis tres cubitos, seu unum metrum, a loculis, sed pauca centimetra. Insuper in aliquibus sacellis habetur altare ex ligno confectum cum lapide consecrato infixo in medio mensae; sed

altare mobile est, ita ut ad libitum transferatur de uno in alio loco eiusdem sacelli. Quaeritur:

I. Utrum permitti possit missae celebratio in istis sacellis, in quibus non habetur praescripta distantia altarium a loculis?

II. Utrum altaria mobilia, sensu exposito, tolerari possint?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito Commissionis Liturgicae voto omnibusque sedulo perpensis, respondendum censuit:

Ad I. Negative iuxta decretum n. 3944 *Romana* 12 Ianuarii 1899 ad II.

Ad II. Affirmative, dummodo mensa solidis basibus adhaereat et altare ipsum in uno tantum loco stabiliter collocetur.

Atque ita rescripsit, die 19 Iunii 1908.

S. Card. Cretoni, *Praef.*

II.

Festum SS. Ambrosii et Caroli ad ritum duplicem maiorem in dioecesibus Provinciae Mediolanen. suffraganeis, elevatur.

Provinciae ecclesiasticae Mediolanensis Episcopi in Concilium Provinciale VIII, E.mo et R.mo D.no Andrea Ferrari Metropolita Praeside, nuperrime congregati, quo firmior posteritati tradatur iucunda memoria et recordatio Patrum et ipsius Concilii, cum magna animarum consensione et devotione, ad maiorem Dei gloriam et eiusdem Provinciae bonum promovendum celebrati praeter cetera quae ad finem sibi propositum maxime convenire existimantes decreverunt, Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papa X supplicia vota enixasque preces porrigere statuerunt, ac reapse porrexerunt, ut Apostolica auctoritate interveniente, duo illa ecclesiae Metropolitanae Lumina et Sidera flammantia Ambrosius et Carolus ecclesiis quoque Suffraganeis per solemniorem cultum et ritum liturgicum novo effulgeant splendore. Hinc reverenter expostularunt, ut festa utriusque Sancti Episcopi et Confessoris ad ritum duplicem maiorem evecta, eisdem Suffraganeis ecclesiis, de Apostolica benignitate concedantur. Sanctitas porro Sua, referente subscripto Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis

Secretario, has preces peramanter excipiens, petitam festorum Sanctorum Ambrosii Episc. Conf. et Eccles. Doct. et Caroli Episc. Conf., ad ritum duplicem maiorem elevationem dioecesibus Provinciae ecclesiasticae Mediolanensis Suffraganeis indulgere dignata est; servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 26 Augusti 1908.

Pro E.mo Card. Praef. Fr. H. M. Gotti.

L. * S.

✠ D. Panici, Archiep. Laodicen., *Secret.*

III.

Novae Lectiones historicae in festo S. Bonaventurae.

die xiv iulii

S. Bonaventurae Episc. Conf. et Eccl. Doct. Duplex.

Omnia de Communi Conf. Pont. praeter sequ.

In utrisque Vesperis. Ad Magnificat. Ant. *O Doctor . . . Beate Bonaventura.*

Oratio. *Deus, qui populo tuo.*

In I. Nocturno. Lect. *Sapientiam* de Communi Doct.

In II. Nocturno.

Lectio IV. Bonaventura, Balneoregii in Etruria natus, a lethali morbo adhuc puer, beati Francisci precibus, cuius religioni, si convaluisset, voto matris dicatus fuerat, evasit incolumis. Itaque adolescens, Fratrum Minorum institutum amplecti voluit, in quo ad eam doctrinae praestantiam Alexandro de Ales magistro pervenit, ut septimo post anno Parisiis magisterii lauream adeptus, libros Sententiarum publice summa cum laude sit interpretatus, quos etiam praeclaris postea commentariis illustravit. Nec scientiae solum eruditione, sed, et morum integritate, vitaeque innocentia, humilitate, mansuetudine, terrenarum rerum contemptu et coelestium desiderio mirifice excelluit: dignus plane, qui tamquam perfectionis exemplar haberetur, et a beato Thoma Aquinate, cui summa charitate coniunctus erat, sanctus appellaretur. Is enim, cum sancti Francisci vitam illum scribentem comperisset: *Sinamus,* ait, *sanctum pro sancto laborare.*

Lectio V. Divini amoris flamma succensus, erga Christi Domini passionem, quam iugiter meditabatur, ac Deiparam Virginem, cui se totum devoverat, singulari ferebatur pietatis affectu: quem in aliis etiam verbo et exemplo excitare, scriptisque opusculis augere summopere studuit. Hinc illa morum suavitas, gratia sermonis, et charitas in omnes effusa, qua singulorum animos sibi arctissime devinciebat. Quamobrem vix quinque et triginta annos natus, Romae summo omnium consensu Generalis Ordinis Minister electus est: susceptumque munus per duodeviginti annos admirabili prudentia gessit ac laude sanctitatis. Plura constituit regulari disciplinae et amplificando Ordini utilia; quem una cum aliis Ordinibus mendicantibus adversus obtrectatorum calumnias feliciter propugnavit.

Lectio VI. Ad Lugdunense Concilium a beato Gregorio Decimo accersitus, et Cardinalis Episcopus Albanensis creatus, arduis Concilii rebus egregiam navavit operam: qua et schismatis dissidia composita sunt, et ecclesiastica dogmata vindicata. Quibus in laboribus, anno aetatis suae quinquagesimo tertio, salutis vero millesimo ducentesimo septuagesimo quarto, summo omnium moerore decessit, ab universo Concilio, ipso praesente Romano Pontifice, funere honestatus. Eum Xystus quartus plurimis maximisque clarum miraculis in Sanctorium numerum retulit. Multa scripsit, in quibus summam eruditionem cum pietatis ardore coniungens, lectorem docendo movet; quare a Xysto quinto Doctoris Seraphici nomine merito est insignitus.

In III. Nocturno. Homilia in Evang. *Vos estis sal terrae*, de Communi Doct. 3° loco.

URBIS ET ORBIS

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X, libenter deferens supplicibus votis plurium Sacrorum Antistitum, praeeunte E.mo D.no Cardinali Antonio Agliardi Episcopo Albanensi, a R.mo P. Ministro Generali Ordinis Minorum Conventualium humillime depromptis, suprascriptas Lectiones secundi Nocturni, quibus Franciscales Familiae iamdudum

utuntur in festo S. Bonaventurae, Cardinalis Episcopi Albanensis, Lectionibus historicis substituendas mandavit, quae nimium ieiunae modo habentur de ipso Seraphico Doctore in Breviario Romano. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 22 Iulii 1908.

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. * S.

✠ D. PANICI, Arch. Laodicen., *Secret.*

IV.

ADDITIONES ET VARIATIONES IN BREVIARIO ET MISSALI ROMANO.

ADDENDA ET VARIANDA IN DUABUS TABELLIS EXCERPTIS E RUBRICIS GENERALIBUS BREVIARII.

Duplicia secundae classis, in quibus de simplicibus fit commemoratio tantum in Laudibus; de aliis uti in Rubricis.

Circumcisio Domini.

. . . . . .

Purificatio B. M. V.

Visitatio B. M. V.

Nativitas B. M. V.

Festum Septem Dolorum B. M. V. (Dom. III Sept.).

Solemnitas SS.mi Rosarii B. M. V.

. . . . . .

Duplicia maiora per annum, quae aliis duplicibus minoribus praeferuntur.

Transfiguratio Domini.

. . . . . .

Festum Septem Dolorum B. M. V. (Feria VI post Dom. Passionis).

Commemoratio B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo.

. . . . . .

VARIANDA IN CATALOGO FESTORUM, QUAE UTI PRIMARIA VEL SECUNDARIA ETC.

Festa secundaria.

§ II. *Duplicia secundae classis.*

Festum SS.mi Nominis Iesu.

. . . . . .

Festum Septem Dolorum B. M. V. (Dom. III Septembr.).
Solemnitas SS.mi Rosarii B. M. V.

. . . . . .

§ III. *Duplicia maiora.*

Exaltatio S. Crucis.

Festum Septem Dolorum B. M. V. (Feria VI post Dom. Passionis).

Commemoratio B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo.

. . . . . .

RUBRICA REFORMANDA IN BREVIARIO ET MISSALI ROMANO.

Dominica III Septembris. Deleatur integra Rubrica: "Impedita . . . post Dom. III Septembris." Eius loco substituatur sequens: "Hac Dominica si occurrat festum nobilius, tamquam in sede propria celebretur festum B. V. M. Perdolentis prima sequenti die, non impedita a festo nobiliori, ac translato Duplici maiori, vel Doctoris Ecclesiae; de Duplici vero minori vel semiduplici occurrente fiat tantum commemoratio iuxta Rubricas."

RUBRICA REFORMANDA IN BREVIARIO.

Dominica infra Octavam Nativitatis B. M. V.: "Si haec Dominica immediate sequatur festum Nativitatis, Vesperae dicuntur integrae de ipsa Nativitate sine commemoratione SS.mi Nominis Mariae. Si hac Dominica occurrat festum nobilius, eo anno festum SS.mi Nominis celebretur die duodecima Septembris, tamquam in sede propria, uti notatur in Martyrologio. Sicubi vero die duodecima occurrat festum nobilius, Officium SS.mi Nominis Mariae transferatur in primam diem liberam iuxta Rubricas."

SS.mus Dominus Noster Pius PP. X referente infrascripto Cardinali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi Praefecto, suprascriptas additiones et variationes inserendas Breviario et Missali Romano benigne approbare dignatus est. Die 8 Iulii 1908.

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

✠ D. PANICI, Archiep. Laodic., *Secret.*

V.

ANTISTITES AMERICAE, OCEANIAE ET AUSTRALIAE, PERDURANTE MARITIMO ITINERE, SACRUM IN NAVIS SINGULIS DIEBUS PERAGERE POSSUNT, DUMMODO LOCUS SIT DECENS, MARE TRANQUILLUM, ET IN QUANTUM FIERI POTEST, SACERDOS PRAESULI CELEBRANTE ADSISTAT.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X, clementer deferens supplicibus votis Sacrorum Praesulum ecclesiarum sive dioeceseon totius Americae, Oceaniae atque Australiae, privilegium benigne impertiri dignatus est, quo ipsi R.mi Sacrorum Antistites, quotiescumque Romam petituri sint, perdurante maritimo itinere, etiam in reditu, singulis diebus Sacrum in navi peragere valeant: dummodo locus ad hoc delectus nihil indecens aut indecorum praeseferat; mare sit adeo tranquillum, ut nullum prorsus adsit periculum effusionis sacrarum specierum e calice, et—si adsit—alter sacerdos superpelliceo indutus, Praesuli celebranti adsistat. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 30 Iunii 1908.

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

✠ D. PANICI, Arch. Laodicen., *Secret.*

VI.

CIRCA INDULTA OFFICIORUM VOTIVORUM DE SS. SACRAMENTO ET DE IMMACULATA CONCEPTIONE *B. M. V.*

Postulato R.mi D.ni Episcopi Osnabrugen. Provicarii Apostolici Missionum Germaniae Septentrionalis et Administratoris Praefecturae Apostolicae Slevigis Holsatiae: "utrum Officia votiva antiqua de praecepto recitanda singulis feriis quintis non impeditis de SS.mo Sacramento, et singulis Sabbatis item non impeditis de Immaculata Conceptione B. M. V., sint revocata per nova Officia votiva ad libitum recitanda et concessa cum decreto generali n. 3581 *Urbis et Orbis* 5 Iulii 1883"; Sacra Rituum Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, auditoque voto Commissionis Liturgicae, respondendum censuit:

"Negative, nisi expresse renuntiatum fuerit antiquis indultis, iuxta ipsum citatum decretum, ubi in fine ad I legitur:

Firmis remanentibus aliis votivorum Officiorum indultis quibuscumque iam concessis ". Atque ita rescripsit, die 5 Iunii 1908.

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. * S.

✠ D. PANICI, Archiep. Laodicen., *Secretarius.*

VII.

S. IOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS PATRONUS CONCIONATORUM DECLARATUR.

Quo congruus accedat cumulus solemnibus sacrisque pompis nuper expletis in honorem celeberrimi totius Ecclesiae Doctoris, Ioannis ob aureum eloquentiae flumen cognomento Chrysostomi, mox elapso saeculo decimoquinto, ex quo sanctus ipse Antistes exilio multatus iniuste, ac mala multa perpessus, supremum diem obivit; R.mus P. Hugo Athanasius Gaisser, ex Ordine Sancti Benedicti, Pontificii Graecorum Collegii moderator, vota depromens peculiaris Coetus eiusmodi honoribus Chrysostomo tribuendis in Urbe constituti, ac munere suo feliciter perfuncti, Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum Pium Papam Decimum supplex rogavit, ut eumdem Sanctum Doctorem christianae eloquentiae et coelestem sacrorum concionatorum Patronum suprema auctoritate Sua declarare ac statuere dignaretur. Id siquidem fe. re. Leo Decimus tertius die quarta Iulii anno millesimo octingentesimo octogesimo quarto indubie praenunciaverat, sacros videlicet oratores in fidem ac tutelam collocando S. Ioannis Chrysostomi, Ecclesiae Doctoris, quem omnibus ad imitandum proponebat exemplar, utpote qui christianorum oratorum facile princeps, ob aureum eloquentiae flumen, invictum dicendi robur, vitaeque sanctitudinem summis laudibus ubique celebretur. Sanctitas porro Sua has preces ab infrascripto Cardinali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi Praefecto relatas peramanter excipiens, praeclarum Ecclesiae universae Doctorem decusque Sanctum Episcopum Ioannem Chrysostomum, oratorum sacrorum coelestem Patronum Apostolica auctoritate Sua declaravit et constituit; eumdemque quemadmodum cunctis fidelibus omnigenae virtutis, ita christianae eloquentiae ad imitandum exemplar sacris

concionatoribus libentissime proposuit. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 8 Iulii 1908

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praefectus.*

✠ D. PANICI, Archiep. Laodicen., *Secret.*

VIII.

DUBIA DE ORDINE SERVANDO CIRCA COMMEMORATIONES IN SECUNDIS VESPERIS ET DE VERSU "FIDELIUM ANIMAE."

R. D. Onesimus Machez, magister caeremoniarum ecclesiae cathedralis Atrebaten., et extensor Kalendarii dioecesani, de licentia sui R.mi Episcopi, a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione insequentium dubiorum solutionem humillime flagitavit, nimirum:

I. Quando celebratur festum duplex Dominica infra Octavam communem, ponitur in Laudibus commemoratio Dominicae, deinde Octavae; debetne in secundis Vesperis idem ordo servari pro commemorationibus, si feria secunda sequenti fit Officium de die infra Octavam, vel poni primo loco commemoratio Octavae?

II. Quando feria VI post Octavam Ascensionis recolitur festum duplex aut semiduplex quod in secundis Vesperis concurrit cum festo eiusdem ritus ob Vigiliam Pentecostes simplificando, debetne prius fieri commemoratio huius festi simplificati ac postea feriae aut inversus ordo servari?

III. Post Horam tertiam quae praecedit Missam pontificalem, Episcopus celebrans debetne, dicto per chorum "*Benedicamus Domino*" omittere versum "*Fidelium animae?*"

Et sacra eadem Congregatio ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito Commissionis Liturgicae suffragio, omnibus sedulo perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I et II Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam, iuxta decretum n. 3843 *Commemorationum in Vesperis* 5 Februarii 1895 quia habetur concursus et commemoratio sumatur e primis Vesperis iuxta Rubricas.

Ad III Affirmative in casu.

Atque ita rescripsit, die 5 Iunii 1908.

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. * S.

✠ D. PANICI, Archiep. Laodicen., *Secret.*

E SACRA CONGR. INDULGENTIARUM.

Indulgentiae pro Scapulare de Monte Carmelo gestantibus.

Confratres qui legitime acceperunt S. Scapulare a sacerdote deputato per PP. Generales O. Fratrum B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo aut de eorum assensu a PP. Provincialibus, et illud semper super humeros gestant, consequuntur sequentes indulgentias et infrascriptis privilegiis et indultis gaudent.

I. indulgentia plenaria.

Si confessi ac S. Synaxi refecti sodales ad mentem Summi Pontificis oraverint:

1. die illa, qua, accipiendo S. Scapulare, confraternitatem ingrediuntur;

2. in festo commemorationis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, die 16 Iulii, vel una eiusdem mensis Dominica, iuxta locorum consuetudinem;

3. eodem die *quoties* ecclesiam vel publicum sacellum visitaverint, ubi S. Scapularis sodalitium canonice erectum reperitur;

4. in una ex Dominicis cuiusvis mensis, si processioni a confraternitate, de Ordinarii licentiae, peragendae interfuerint;

5. in festo Pentecostes;

6. die commemorationis Defunctorum Ordinis Carmelitici (15 Novembris, vel, si Dominica fuerit, die 16);

7. in mortis articulo, si uti supra dispositi, vel saltem contriti, SS. Iesu nomen ore si potuerint, sin minus corde devote invocaverint.

II. indulgentiae partiales.

1. *Quinque annorum totidemque quadragenarum:*

(*a*) semel in mense, die cuiusque arbitrio eligenda, qua sodales confessi ac S. Synaxi refecti iuxta intentionem Summi Pontificis oraverint;

(*b*) si SS. Sacramentum, dum ad infirmos defertur, cum candela accensa et pro iisdem pias ad Deum preces fundendo, comitati fuerint.

2. *Trium annorum totidemque quadragenarum* in qualibet ex festivitatibus B. Mariae V., quae in universa Ecclesia celebrantur, si sodales confessi et S. Synaxi in ecclesia vel capella

confraternitatis refecti fuerint et ad mentem Summi Pontificis oraverint.

3. *Trecentorum dierum* pro abstinentia singulis feriis IV et Sabbatis per annum.

4. *Centum dierum* quotiescumque aliquod pietatis vel caritatis opus corde saltem contrito ac devote sodales exercuerint.

5. Si confratres, corde saltem contrito ac devote, ecclesiam vel capellam sodalitii visitaverint:

(*a*) *septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum* quibuslibet infra annum feria IV et Sabbato;

(*b*) *trecentorum dierum* quocumque alio anni die.

Omnes et singulae praefatae indulgentiae, excepta plenaria in mortis articulo lucranda, etiam animabus fidelium defunctorum applicari possunt.

III. PRIVILEGIA.

1. Privilegium, vulgo dictum *Sabbatinum*, Summi Pontificis Ioan. XXII, a Clemente VII *Ex clementi* 12 Aug. 1530, S. Pio V *Superna dispositione* 18 Feb. 1566, Gregorio XIII *Ut laudes* 18 Sept. 1577, aliisque approbatum et confirmatum, nec non a S. Romana et Universali Inquisitione sub Paulo V, die 20 Ian. 1613, decreto tenoris sequentis: "Patribus Carmelitanis permittitur praedicare quod populus christianus possit pie credere de adiutorio animarum fratrum et confratrum sodalitatis Beatissimae Virginis Mariae de Monte Carmelo, videlicet Beatissimam Virginem animas fratrum et confratrum in charitate decedentium, qui in vita habitum gestaverint et castitatem pro suo statu coluerint, Officiumque parvum recitaverint, vel, si recitare nesciant, Ecclesiae ieiunia observaverint et feria quarta et Sabbato a carnibus abstinuerint (nisi in iis diebus Nativitatis Domini festum inciderit), suis intercessionibus continuis piisque suffragiis et meritis ac speciali protectione post eorum transitum, praecipue in die Sabbati, qui dies ab Ecclesia eidem Beatissimae Virgini dicatus est, adiuturam."

2. Omnes et singulae Missae, quae in suffragium celebrantur confratrum, eodem gaudent privilegio ac si in altari privilegiato celebratae fuissent.

3. Absolutio generalis cum indulgentia plenaria in articulo mortis sodalibus impertiri potest a facultatem habente, vel, ea deficiente, a quovis confessario approbato.

IV. INDULTA.

1. Omnes confratres, si in locis versantur ubi nulla Carmelitani Ordinis reperiatur ecclesia, omnes indulgentias ab Apostolica Sede eiusdem Ordinis ecclesiis concessas vel concedendas lucrari possunt, si, ceteris conditionibus adimpletis, parochialem ecclesiam statis diebus devote visitaverint. Ubi autem existit aliqua confraternitatis ecclesia, hanc tenentur sodales ad easdem indulgentias lucrandas visitare, nisi plusquam unius miliarii spatio distet.

2. Sodales qui menstruae processioni commode assistere nequeunt, *plenariam indulgentiam* sub n. 4 relatam lucrari valent, si ceteris positis conditionibus, capellam respectivae confraternitatis eadem die visitaverint.

3. Ubi processio praedicta locum non habet, vel confraternitas erecta non reperitur, confratres *plenariam memoratam indulgentiam* Dominica III cuiusque mensis lucrantur, si ceteris adimpletis, quamcumque ecclesiam vel publicum oratorium visitaverint.

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita praesens Summarium ex authenticis documentis excerptum approbavit typisque imprimi ac publicare benigne permisit.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis, die 4 Iulii 1908.

S. Card. CRETONI, *S. R. C. Praef.*

✠ D. PANICI, Arch. Laodicen., S. R. C., *Secret.*

LICET SEPARARE AD LIBITUM SINGULAS DECADAS ROSARII.

Indultum diei 14 Octobr. 1906, sodalibus SS. Rosarii concedens ut indulgentias omnes recitationi coronae adnexas obtineant, etiamsi singulas decadas ad libitum per diem separarent, nunc, ex concessione Procuratori Generali Praedicatorum facta, per Indultum diei 8 Julii 1908, ad omnes fideles extenditur:

Sanctissimus Dominus noster Pius Papa X in audientia habita die 8 Iulii 1908, ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto sacrae Congregationis, Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, benigne annuit pro gratia iuxta preces, ceteris servatis de iure servandis.

Praesenti in perpetuum valituro.

Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, e secretaria eiusdem sacrae Congregationis, die 8 Iulii 1908.

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. * S.

✠ D. PANICI, Arch. Laodicen., *Secret.*

INDULGENTIA ADNECTITUR DUABUS ORATIONIBUS PRO CLERICIS. ORATIO AD POSTULANDOS CLERICOS.

Ant. Quid statis tota die otiosi? Ite et vos in vineam meam.

V. Rogate Dominum messis.

R. Ut mittat operarios in messem suam.

Oremus. Deus qui non vis mortem peccatoris, sed magis ut convertatur et vivat, da, quaesumus, per intercessionem B. Mariae semper Virginis et omnium Sanctorum, operarios Ecclesiae tuae, qui sint cooperatores Christi, et se impendant et superimpendant pro animabus. Per eumdem D. N. I. C.

ORATIO PRO CONSERVATIONE CLERICORUM IN MILITIA.

Ant. Nemo mittens manum suam ad aratrum et auspiciens retro aptus est regno Dei.

V. Nemo militans Deo implicat se negotiis saecularibus.

R. Ut ei placeat cui se probavit.

Oremus. Deus infirmitatis humanae singulare praesidium, exaudi, quaesumus, preces quas pro fratribus in discrimine positis humiliter fundimus, ut famulos tuos ab omni eruas peccatorum nequitia et in tua protectionis securitate constituas. Per D. N. I. C. etc.

Utramque hanc orationem recitantibus devote, indulgentiam tercentorum dierum pro unaquaque concedimus.

Die 29 Martii 1908.

PIUS PAPA X.

Praesentis Rescripti authenticum exemplar exhibitum fuit huic S. Congt'ni Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae.

Datum Romae e Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis, die 30 Martii 1908.

✠ D. PANICI, Archiep. Laodicen., *Secretarius.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

S. Congregation of Rites:

1. (*a*) Prohibits the saying of Masses in mortuary chapels where the altar is not a full yard away from the buried body.

(*b*) Permits the use of portable altars in mortuary chapels, provided the *mensa* of the altar rests upon solid supports, and the altar is definitely located in one set place.

2. Raises the feast of St. Ambrose, and of St. Charles Borromeo, to the double major rite within the ecclesiastical province of Milan.

3. Assigns new historical lessons for the feast of St. Bonaventure in the Roman Breviary. These lessons are taken from the Franciscan Breviary.

4. Decrees the adoption of certain additions and changes in the general rubrics of the Roman Office (Breviary and Missal).

5. Grants to the Bishops of America, Oceanica, and Australasia, the privilege of celebrating Mass daily on the high seas, during their voyages to and from Rome. The Mass is to be said in a place suited to the sacredness of the function and during tranquil weather, in order that there may be no danger of spilling the Sacred Species. Whenever it is possible, a priest is to be in attendance during the celebration.

6. Rules that the Office of the Blessed Sacrament on Thursdays, and of the Immaculate Conception on Saturdays, when once made obligatory in the diocese, may not be recited *ad libitum*, as the other Votive Offices of the week may be.

7. Formally declares St. John Chrysostom the Patron of Preachers.

8. Decides certain doubts about the order to be observed in commemorations at second Vespers; also that the verse *Fidelium animae* is to be omitted in choir at the end of Terce, when pontifical Mass immediately ensues.

S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES:

1. Publishes a revised list of indulgences and privileges attached to the wearing of the Brown Scapular.

2. Sanctions the extension of the privilege, hitherto granted only to members of the Rosary Confraternity, of interrupting the recitation of the beads at any time during the day, without thereby forfeiting the indulgences attached to the recitation of the rosary.

3. Indulgences two prayers for the obtaining and conserving of vocations to the priesthood.

THE BINDING FORCE OF THE DECISIONS OF THE ROMAN CONGREGATIONS.

Qu. In the *Ave Maria* for 21 November, on page 662, I read:

As an offset to the flood of loose talk, and the occasional stream of loose writing, one meets with on a subject of some importance, it is distinctly worth while to reflect on this paragraph from *Rome:*

"The Roman Congregations, then, are not infallible in their judgments or in their doctrinal decisions concerning faith and morals, even when they have the approval of the Pope; but it does not by any means follow that such sentences and decisions are not binding. To assert the contrary would be to deny the obligation of obedience to the Vicar of Christ himself except in those cases when he exercises his gift of infallibility. It would mean anarchy in the Church. The Pope, even when he is not defining infallibly doctrines of faith and morals, is always the supreme authority in the Church, and as such has a right to our obedience in all religious matters; and the obedience due from Catholics to the doctrinal decisions of the Roman Congregations is the obedience due to the authentic magisterium of the Church as far as this is delegated to them."

The mental habit of requiring a dogmatic definition before assenting to any truth, or acquiescing in any disciplinary procedure, is not the hallmark of an exemplary Catholic in any rank of life or any stage of intellectual culture.

Will you kindly explain whether (and why) the "assent" (spoken of by the *Ave Maria*) to decisions in matters of doctrine by a Roman Congregation is an assent binding only *externally* (i. e., requiring obedient Catholics, whether learned in theology or not, to avoid external utterance of any opposite view) or *internally* (i. e., requiring the "assent" of the *intellect* to the statement of the decisions, to the exclusion ab-

solutely of any opposed view previously held by the aforesaid learned or non-learned Catholics)? I seek a clear answer, since I think there may be others in the predicament in which I find myself, of never having had such a question explained in my theological course. "DOCIBILIS."

Resp. Since the decisions of the Roman Congregations, when not actually reiterating some infallible doctrine of the Church, are based either upon reasons of historical evidence, such as tradition, documentary proof, and common consent, or upon motives of expediency which, without setting aside known truths or facts, tends to preserve unity of action, it must follow, not only that they are revocable, but also that they would be revoked or amended should new historical evidence or fresh motives of common utility call for such a change. Now the individual, either because he possesses exceptional sources of information or because of that intuitive knowledge which is sometimes accorded to genius or to saints, *may* easily be in position to forecast this change, and therefore feel reluctant to give the assent of his mind to the view which the decision proposes, but to which, for reasons of loyalty and good order, he gives his external consent and full obedience. Such dissent of mind is manifestly based on sufficient reason and therefore not censurable so long as it is not made use of to disturb the external order for which the administrative and doctrinal tribunals of the Church legislate. Our answer would therefore be: The decisions in matters of doctrine by a Roman Congregation, whilst they do bind our obedient will, in conscience and under pain of sin, according to the respective gravity and import of the decisions, yet do not require the assent of the intellect to the statement of the decisions, unless they involve a truth or doctrine otherwise infallibly defined. See an article on the subject: March, 1908, p. 233.

PASTORAL RELATIONS OF OUR MISSIONARY CLERGY UNDER THE NEW ROMAN CONGREGATIONS.

Qu. Are pastors in this country now obliged to offer the Holy Sacrifice *pro populo* on Sundays and Holidays and other feast days you mention in Vol. 22, p. 529, ECCLES. REVIEW?

Resp. It may be safely assumed that the pastoral status of the clergy and the dependency of religious communities in the United States, as in other countries formerly under the jurisdiction of the S. C. of Propaganda, remain unchanged by the recent transfer of the missionary administration of the Roman ecclesiastical tribunals, until definite instructions are issued to the respective authorities who are in charge of diocesan or of conventual bodies. The only definite changes at present in force are those caused by the relations of the bishops and clergy toward the Roman tribunals in cases of diocesan reports, judicial appeals, and requests for faculties in particular cases. The rest will be made known in good time.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECT OF RELIGION IN POLITICS.

(*Communicated.*)

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States, and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."—*Constitution of the United States (Article VI, Paragraph 3).*

The recent public and unequivocal expression of opinion by Mr. Roosevelt, President of the United States, regarding the habit, indulged by certain over-zealous sectaries, of applying a religious test in connexion with the voting of American citizens for the chief executive of this Republic, has aroused widespread attention. The President does not hesitate to stigmatize the bigotry of those who would discriminate against a Catholic candidate on the ground of his religion. As a result, there have been heard many voices, chiefly from the Lutheran and Baptist camps, protesting against the assumption that a Roman Catholic could be a thoroughly loyal citizen of our Republic, or a just and unbiased chief executive as President of the United States. To enforce the protest they appeal to a Catholic doctrine, of their own conception, as standing for a slavish allegiance to the Roman Pontiff, indiscriminately in matters both civil and religious. Polemics with sectarian bigots and political agitators, even though they be our fellow-citizens who injure us much by their misrepresentations, are not within the scope of the Ec-

CLESIASTICAL REVIEW. Yet it may serve the clergy in some ways to point out the legal aspect of the question and to emphasize the fundamental principles on which our Constitutional Government and the rights of individual citizens, whatever their religious convictions, are based. It may help to keep in check the political bigots who are so prone to make capital out of religious agitation.

In 1788, one hundred and twenty years ago, when the Constitution was submitted to the Thirteen Original States for approval, the proposed draft was hotly debated in some of the legislatures, and there was at the time a good deal of religious bigotry apparent in the discussion. Nor need we wonder at the animosity, even regarded from the legal viewpoint. It was a serious question with the representatives of the various States, whether a Catholic should be eligible to office under the National Government, since their approval involved the acceptance of a permanent bond which was to become the Fundamental Law of the Nation. The Constitution, the primary Law of the United States, is a solemn fact; and while it stands, it binds every citizen, be he Lutheran or Baptist.

Blackstone defines law as follows: "A rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in the state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong." If we apply this definition to Article VI of the Constitution it becomes plain at once that every citizen, no matter what his religious convictions, or the locality of his origin or his domicile, is emphatically commanded, when he approaches the polls, to expel from his mind all thought of the "religious test." In like manner is he prohibited from appealing to the "religious test" when called upon to decide as to qualification for office under the National Government. In the mind of the Constitutional student it is an offence to apply the "religious test," quite as much so as to counterfeit money, with this difference only, that the language used in Article VI, pertaining to the "religious test," is decidedly more vigorous than that employed in Article I, Section 8, which reads: "Congress shall have power to coin money, and to provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States." Both crimes are of pronounced turpitude. The accidental difference in the force of the two prohibitions is that the one has the sanction of a penal enact-

ment, whereas the other was regarded as too unworthy a citizen of the soon to be established commonwealth to require such a caution of its avoidance; for the framers of the Constitution hoped that gratitude to Almighty God for the blessings received in deliverance from a tyrant's rule would be a sufficient guaranty against the violation of the religious rights of the individual conscience.

In 1787, the Federal Convention sat in Philadelphia and prepared the several articles of the Constitution. This was less than six years after the Catholic King, Louis XVI of France, had sent to our aid the six thousand Catholic soldiers who valiantly fought for the liberties of our people at the battle of Yorktown. Nor were the men who sat in the Federal Convention, unmindful, when framing Article VI, of the services rendered by Catholics in the struggle for independence, and therefore in the last clause of the last Article, pertaining to the rights and duties of citizens under the new government, they set down in the strongest and clearest language possible their abhorrence of religious bigotry: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

When the Fathers were engaged in the memorable work of framing the Constitution, the question was examined, as to how long a foreigner should be required to be a resident of the United States before eligibility to membership in the National Legislature should be granted. The qualification fixed for a member of the House of Representatives is twelve years; that for a member of the U. S. Senate is fourteen years. The *Federalist* assigns the reason why the senatorial qualification is greater than the congressional: "The propriety of the distinction is explained by the nature of the senatorial trust which, participating immediately in transactions with foreign nations, ought to be exercised by none, who are not thoroughly weaned from the prepossessions and habits incident to foreign birth and education."

The constitutional writers are agreed that the Federal Convention was one of the most remarkable deliberative bodies known to history. This fact must have been entirely unknown to those who have protested to the President. Again, when the Thirteen Original States ratified the Constitution, they approved of Article VI. The question immediately present to our mind

is, What did the Federal Convention intend to be understood by Article VI? The answer to this question is found in the constitutions of the several States. Article I, Section 4, Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, reads as follows: "No person who acknowledges the being of a God and a future state of rewards and punishments shall, on account of his religious sentiments, be disqualified to hold any office or place of trust or profit under the Commonwealth." The Supreme Court of the State alone is empowered to interpret this clause. Any misconstruction by a representative portion of our people is well calculated to bring our "Magna Carta" into contempt; for if one clause can be misconstrued by the populace, why not another. Admit the opening wedge, and the disintegration of the American Constitution is inevitable. In 1798, the "Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions" were passed; and the direct consequences of those Resolutions were, first, the "Nullification Act" of 1832, and secondly the Civil War of 1861. There is no surer way to undermine the foundations of our national fabric than by teaching our children that the Constitution no longer means what the framers declared it to be.

How different the sentiments of the sectarian bigots from those which we find in "Washington's Reply" to the address presented him by the Catholics after his election to the Presidency, 1789: "As mankind become liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the Community are equally entitled to the protection of the civil Government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution, and the establishment of your Government: or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

JAMES A. MCNULTY.

CAN THE "SANATIO IN RADICE" BE APPLIED?

Qu. A and B, both baptized, one a Catholic, the other a Protestant, attempt marriage before a Protestant minister in one of our American cities, since the new marriage laws have gone into effect. A, the Catholic party, is penitent and wishes to

have the marriage validated. B, the non-Catholic party, refuses to meet a priest or to renew his consent in order to validate the marriage. Can the *sanatio in radice* be applied in this case?

Resp. Since the nullity of the marriage results from the non-observance of conditions laid down as necessary for validity by law merely ecclesiastical, the Supreme Pontiff can grant and apply the *sanatio in radice.*

The delegated faculty *sanandi in radice* in the form in which it has been usually granted to an American bishop, before Easter, 1908, reads thus: "Sanandi in radice matrimonia contracta quando comperitur adfuisse impedimentum dirimens super quo ex Apostolicae Sedis indulto dispensare ipse possit, magnumque fore incommodum requirendi a parte innoxia renovationem consensus, monita tamen parte conscia impedimenti de effectu hujus sanationis." Since this faculty is limited to those cases only in which the bishop could dispense before the marriage was contracted, it does not extend to the case above, as our Bishops in the United States cannot dispense from the conditions for validity required by the decree *Ne temere.* F. J. S.

WITHDRAWAL FROM SECRET SOCIETIES.

Qu. Mr. X., born a Catholic, joins the Freemasons or Odd Fellows, and retains his membership for ten or twenty-five years. At the time of his joining the society and during all the years of his membership he knew very well that the order was forbidden by the Church. Now penitent, he desires to be reconciled to the Church and admitted to the Sacraments. If he gives good and substantial proofs that he has really left the society and promises never more to return to it, can not his confessor (I mean any priest to whom he goes to confession) absolve him at once without having special recourse to the Ordinary? Some of the Reverend Clergy hereabouts claim that it is a reserved case and that special faculties are required to absolve him, no matter what he actually does or promises to do. J. P. W.

Resp. Any priest who has the faculties ordinarily granted

to our clergy can absolve a person who had joined the Freemasons, Odd Fellows, or other condemned societies, provided the penitent is willing at the time of absolution to abandon the association. If the confessor should not have the faculty enjoyed by our clergy generally to absolve from cases comprised in the Bull *Apostolicae Sedis*, then he would have to have recourse to higher authority in the case of a person who is a Freemason, for this society is condemned *sub censura*; but such recourse would not be necessary in the case of a member of the Order of Odd Fellows, which, though condemned as a society to be shunned, is not forbidden *sub censura*. In all similar cases the condition of reservation is simply "donec ab illis societatibus se prorsus amoverint." When, for grave reasons a person, unconscious of the forbidden character of the society at the time when he entered it and desirous of severing his connexion with it, wishes nevertheless to retain a passive or nominal membership in the forbidden order, so as not to forfeit the purely financial benefits to which his actual contributions to the insurance fund of the society entitle him in equity, the matter is to be presented to the Apostolic Delegate, who will decide according to the particular merits of each case. The conditions are that the membership was originally *bona fide*; that the retention of nominal membership causes no manner of scandal to others who may not understand it; that there is question of a considerable loss if membership were absolutely given up; that there is no danger of perversion from the faith, nor a probability that on the death of such nominal member the masonic or other non-Catholic rite be enforced at his funeral.

GENUFLECTING AFTER COMMUNION.

Qu. I have been asked in what manner nuns should retire from the altar-rail after Communion—with or without genuflexion—and I have failed to find a definite ruling. Martinucci (II, V, 23) prescribes a genuflexion for clerics in the sanctuary, but opposed to this is, I am told, the custom in many communi-

ties of nuns of leaving the altar-rail without genuflexion. Will you kindly cite me what the ruling may be on the point?

CHAPLAIN.

Resp. Although rubricists prescribe the genuflexion for clerics receding from the altar after the reception of Holy Communion, there is no similar rule for those who receive outside the sanctuary, unless they pass from one side to the other; and it would cause great inconvenience and confusion in many instances if the rules for genuflecting that are observed within the sanctuary were to be applied to the laity or to religious not bound to the strict observance of a canonical choir. Indeed, even in such communities *custom* is the chief norm which regulates the genuflexions, because it is assumed to arise from the convenience, if not necessity, imposed by the locality or other circumstances. The S. Congregation of Rites respects this element of reasonable custom in religious communities to such a degree that it sanctions even a distinct deviation from the general rubrics laid down in the Missal. An example of this is the decision given under the head *Divion.* (S. R. C., 26 Sept., 1868, *Decr. auth.* 3182), in which the question whether the canons of the cathedral are bound to observe the genuflexions prescribed in Tit. XVII, n. 5 of the Missal, at the conventual Masses, proposed by the Master of Ceremonies, was answered by, *Servetur consuetudo.*

HEAD-COVERING OF WOMEN IN CHURCH.

Qu. Would you, please, kindly inform me and many others, who are in doubt about a supposed rule compelling women to wear a head-gear in church. Is there a rule or law of the Church, which obliges women to wear a hat or head-covering in church? Weltzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* says: "Nach den Untersuchungen de Rossi's besteht keine Gewaehr dafuer, dass Papst Linus den Frauen die Verschleierung in der Kirche geboten hat."

Does *usus* or church decorum require head-covering for women in church? Should ladies and girls be told not to appear in church without hats?

PH. W.

Resp. There is no present and universal ecclesiastical law that obliges women to appear in the church with or without any particular head-covering. Usage and decorum in Italy and other Catholic countries appear to be in favor of the wearing of veils, and there is a decision of the S. Congregation answering this question, whether women assisting at the sacred functions in church should wear veils, in the affirmative (*Decr. authent.*, 7 July, 1876, n. 3402). The decision is for Ravenna.

To the question whether women and young girls should be told by the priest not to come to church without hats, we would answer emphatically, no; at least not as though such a prohibition were the law of the Church. We have other ways of inculcating upon women what modesty demands of them in church, and the priest who enters into the details of millinery, or even notices them, must have exceptional qualities if he can manage to talk about such things without forfeiting some of that high esteem which our women ought to have for their pastors. Our suggestion would be to let their hats alone; if we speak rightly to them about their needs of soul, they will most likely come with their veils or hats or whatever is needed to give us the proper impression of their modesty and decorum.

FLOWERS ON A CONSECRATED ALTAR.

Qu. Is it permissible, according to the rubrics, to place vases with flowers on the *mensa* of the altar at Benediction service, or when the Blessed Sacrament is exposed? I am under the impression that this is forbidden, at least in the case of a consecrated altar.

Resp. The *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. I, c. 12, n. 12) states that "vascula cum flosculis frondibusque odoriferis, seu serico contextis, studiose ornata, adhiberi poterunt." Pietro de Amicis, in his *Il Ceremoniale Completo* (Vol. I, n. 28, edit. 1906) interprets this to mean not the altar proper but the steps, above or below the *mensa*, on which the candelabra are

usually set. He gives as a reason the fact that the altar or *mensa*, upon which the Body of Christ is offered, and which covers or contains the relics of the martyrs, may not serve any other purpose, and must remain intact so that nothing but reliquaries of saints and the four gospels, symbolizing the life and doctrine of Christ, are to be permitted upon it. This applies to consecrated altars. Upon an altar which merely serves as a support of an inserted altar-stone, the above-mentioned author thinks flowers might be placed, so long as they do not cause inconvenience to the celebrant or soil the altar-cloths. He adds: *salvo meliori judicio.*

FRANCISCALIA.

The interest which St. Francis of Assisi holds for the reading world shows no signs of abating, but rather seems to be increasing, if one may judge from the output of books in the field of Franciscalia which have appeared during the last twelve months and the announcements of others to be issued during the year 1909. These works, as a whole, comprise either new editions and translations of the early Franciscan legends or original studies dealing with some phase of St. Francis's life or work. Without doubt, the most important addition the year 1908 made to the former class is the critical text of the *Chronica Fratris Jordani,* which tells of the coming of the Friars into Germany, and which Prof. Boehmer of Bonn has recently edited with a wealth of critical apparatus in Tome VI of the *Collection d'Études et de Documents sur l'Histoire Religieuse et Litteraire du Moyen Age,* inaugurated in 1898 by Paul Sabatier with his famous *Speculum Perfectionis.* The next volume in this series will contain a new edition of Eccleston's Chronicle *De Adventu Minorum in Angliam* by Prof. A. E. Little. Meanwhile Prof. Little has just edited the *Liber Exemplorum ad usum Praedicantium* after a thirteenth century MS. preserved at Durham. This work, compiled by an Anglican Franciscan who passed much of his life in Ireland, is the earliest manual for the use of preachers by a Franciscan which has yet been printed, and is the first volume issued un-

der the auspices of the British Society of Franciscan Studies. Nardecchia's reprint of Wadding's *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum*, with the *Supplementum* of Sbaralea, both of which had become extremely rare, and Dr. Ferrers Howell's translation of Celano's "Lives" of St. Francis, which completes the cycle of the early legends of St. Francis in English, must be included among the more notable productions of the year from the standpoint of Franciscan studies. Three lesser works in lighter vein, but all welcome additions to our knowledge of the wonderful Umbrian *Poverello*, are *St. Francis and his Friends*, by the Rev. Horatio Grimley; *The Story of St. Francis*, by Miss Alice Herris, with an introduction by Fr. Cuthbert, O. S. F. C.; and *In the School of St. Francis*, by Mrs. Chambers. Among the new Franciscan works promised for early publication is a critical edition by Prof. Penacchi, of Assisi, of the earliest known MS. life of St. Clare. Two other books on St. Clare, written respectively by Mrs. Reginald Balfour and Ernest Gilliat Smith, are also announced, besides a revised edition of Fr. Cuthbert's popular work, *The Friars and How They came to England*, and a new volume on the same subject by Edward Hutton. Both Fr. Cuthbert and Mrs. Hutton are, by the way, preparing new biographies of St. Francis. And, as if there were not enough English versions of the *Fioretti* or "Little Flowers of St. Francis" already, Chatto and Windus announce a new edition of Prof. Arnold's well-known translation, illustrated in colors. The ever-fragrant *Fioretti*, which were generally little known outside Italy until a comparatively recent date, now seem to be enjoying a special vogue in Northern lands. Flemish, Danish, and Russian versions of it have appeared within a few years, and now Prof. Anesaki of the Imperial University of Tokyo is engaged on a Japanese translation. What might be called the topographical aspect of St. Francis's life is also receiving special attention just now. Under the title of *Pilgrim Walks in Franciscan Italy*, an English version of Joergensen's delightful *Pilgrimsbogen* by A. C. Clarke appeared last month. There is a new work in Italian of the same character, *L'Um-*

bria Serafica illustrata paralelle alla vita de S. Francesco d'Assisi by Fr. Niccolo Cavanna, O. F. M., with some four hundred photographic views, and another illustrated guide-book to Assisi and its sanctuaries by Col. Goff, a well-known English resident of Fiesole, is forthcoming. Meanwhile a new edition of the *Guida illustrata della Verna* by Fr. Saturnino da Caprese, O. F. M., is out.

Mention must also be made of Prof. Tocco's *Studi Franciscani*, of the illustrated volume by Fr. Niccolo Dal Gal on St. Francis's *Canticle of the Sun*, which is to be followed shortly by a study on the musical aspect of the early Franciscan *Laudi Spirituali* by Fr. Eusebius Clop, author of a second work on the Franciscan origin of the *Dies irae*. The long-expected edition of the poems of Jacopone of Todi by Prof. Tenneroni is announced for early publication, besides a volume of *Franciscan Studies* by Montgomery Carmichael, and a work on *St. Francis and Giotto* by a well-known American financier. Meanwhile Prof. Venturi's monograph on the last-named subject, *La Basilica de Assisi*, has called forth much criticism because of the strange views it sets forth with regard to Giotto's frescoes at S. Francesco.

FATHER SLATER'S MORAL THEOLOGY.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In looking over the second volume of Slater's *Moral Theology*, several things struck me as being unfortunate in such a recent book on such a subject. Perhaps your reviewer has already noticed them, perhaps not. Anyhow, let us hope that they will not appear in the editions that will surely follow.

1. On page 22: "There must be no change in the matter and form of the sacraments; not even the Church's authority suffices for that." Is this not incorrect? Why, the Church has only very recently decreed a modification of the form of Extreme Unction in case of accident, etc. If the author had said *substantial* change, then he would be nearer the truth in the case.

2. Page 28: "Attention then, or advertence of the mind to what is being done, is not necessary for the validity of a sacra-

ment." It seems to me that some kind of attention is required to apply the matter and form of a sacrament and to have the intention of doing what the Church wants done.

3. The following, on page 33, seems to be rather doubtful with regard to Matrimony: "So that it is a probable opinion that a lay person who baptizes in sin in a case of necessity, or one who marries and so ministers the sacrament in sin to another party, does not thereby sin grievously." Does this reasoning hold for Matrimony? This is referred to again on page 39.

4. On page 44 we read: "Except in Penance, neither *faith* nor good dispositions are required for the validity of the sacraments," etc. How about the baptism of adults who are baptized for, say, political purposes? On page 63 the author has these words: "If he has the use of reason, an habitual intention at least to receive Baptism is necessary for its validity," etc. Then below, on the same page, words to the same effect from the Council of Trent.

5. On page 93, concerning the giving of Holy Communion he says: "If it falls on the breast or dress of a woman, she should take it reverently in her fingers and give it to the priest, who will then administer it to her as communion." Whence this?

6. On page 109: Question: Were the first Christians taught that the Holy Eucharist should be the first food taken in the day? —What is meant in the first section on page 108?

7. On page 111: Is it necessary to be *in bed* for a month before the sick are allowed to receive Holy Communion when not fasting? Cf. ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1908.

Don't you think it would be better to leave out all matter that is deemed unwise to put into English? If it is an English manual, then it seems to be incongruous to have pages of matter in Latin.

STUDIOSUS.

MODERNISM AS VIEWED BY RUSKIN.

The Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

An interesting article on "Modernism in the Past Year" in your November issue repeats the question "Whence did the word Modernism originate?"

The earliest use of the word I find, in my little rambling reading, is in John Ruskin's lecture on Pre-Raphaelitism. There the

term is employed in a kindred, if not identical, sense with that in the Encyclical of Pope Pius X. The entire lecture is so remarkable an exposition of Modernism in general and of Modernism in art in particular, that it seems well worthy of a separate reprint and wide distribution. B. L.

CLERICS AND TOBACCO.

By a sort of common consent the use of tobacco is regarded as a luxury for men; and hence it would seem becoming in a cleric to abstain from it. On the other hand the entertainment which the pipe, the *prise*, and the stogy afford to men of temperate habits and godly pursuits is recognized as a preventive of many evils, physical and moral, and as a source of much good to society as to the individual. Like wine it has the quality of procuring true sociability, which excludes immoderate self-indulgence and the sickening excess of the epicure who seeks in the gifts of earth enjoyment for its own sake. Few men who smoke are bad men, although it is also probably true that the best men neither smoke, nor drink wine, nor sing merry songs, because they are wholly absorbed in the high and noble things which engage their zeal and love. But the best are ever few, whereas it is desirable that the good be many. Thus it happens that priests for the most part use tobacco in one form or another, even those who make religious profession of being poorer and cleaner and more orderly than seculars, by placing themselves under the obedience of a monastic system of community life.

Whether this favorite diversion of clerical celibates is due to experience of its utility, or whether it rests upon a sort of inspiration that caused the adoption among ecclesiastics of tobacco as a blessing from the outset, the fact seems clear that tobacco owes the recognition of its health-giving qualities and its introduction among the clergy of Italy to the famous Cardinal Prosper Saint-Croix. He had been Consistorial advocate and auditor of the Rota under Pius IV, the pope to whom we owe the chief reforms of ecclesiastical life made at the Council of Trent. He was a man rather of the temper of St.

Charles Borromeo, with whom he must have had frequent intercourse on subjects of ecclesiastical discipline. His learning is attested by his several writings on Canon Law and disciplinary matters; and his wide experience, gained during his sojourns as papal nuncio in Germany, Spain, France, and Portugal, gave him a ripeness of judgment which he showed in his efficient administration of the archbishopric of Arles, to which Catherine de Medici had recommended him. On his return from Portugal he brought with him the newly-discovered weed, and made it so popular in Italy that the term *sancta croce* was commonly used to designate the tobacco-leaf. Bayle in his historical and critical dictionary quotes some verses of Castor Duranti (taken from Mandosio) wherein tobacco is described as a universal remedy for ailments of the body, and a reference is made to its power to alleviate disease similar to the relic of the "Sancta Croce," an allusion which might be deemed irreverent if it were not so obviously a play upon the name of the Cardinal Archbishop who introduced the tobacco-leaf into Rome. The following is the poem:

Nomine quae Sanctae Crucis herba vocatur, ocellis
Subvenit, et sanat plagas, et vulnera jungit,
Discutit et strumas, cancrum cancrosaque sanat
Ulcera, et ambustis prodest scabiemque repellit.
Discutit et morbum cui cessit ab impete nomen,
Calefacit et siccat, stringit mundatque, resolvit,
Et dentum et ventris mulcet capitisque dolores.
Subvenit antiquae tussi, stomachoque rigenti,
Renibus et spleni confert, ultroque, venena
Dira sagittarum domat, ictibus omnibus atris
Haec eadem prodest; gingivis proficit atque
Conciliat somnum. Nuda ossaque carne revestit,
Thoracis vitiis prodest, pulmonis itemque,
Quae duo sic praestat non ulla potentior herba.
Hanc Sanctacrucius Prosper quum Nuncius esset
Sedis Apostolicae Lusitanas missus in oras
Huc adportavit Romanae ad commoda gentis.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

History of Religion. The History of Religion belongs to the department of Bible Study, because it considers Biblical religion as its principal subject, and numbers some of the best Biblical scholars among its most active devotees. In the following paragraphs we shall endeavor to give a brief survey of their general works and their particular studies on the religion of Israel.

I. General Works. Mr. James Hastings, the editor of the *Expository Times*, of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, of the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, has now assumed the responsibility for the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, the first volume of which has recently been published.[1] The work will be completed in ten volumes of about 900 pages each. The program of the work is an ambitious one; it promises to give a complete account of Religion and Ethics so far as they are known. It will contain articles on every separate religious belief and practice, and on every ethical or philosophical idea or custom. Persons and places connected with the history of religion and morals will also be described.

The editor gives no reason for including morality and religion in one work; he feels convinced that one cannot be satisfactorily treated without the other. But he warns us that the work is not a book of apologetics. Not that Christianity does not occupy more space than any other religion, perhaps more than all other forms of religion combined; but the *Encyclopædia* is not prepared for the purpose of making converts to Christianity. Indirectly, however, this result will be obtained, through the clear, though implied, statement of the fact that Christianity possesses the highest moral and spiritual standards.

Mr. Hastings may be classed among the progressive Protes-

[1] T. & T. Clark, London and Edinburgh. 28s. per vol.

tant writers on Biblical subjects, but his personal leanings do not appear to have influenced him in the selection of his contributors. In this respect, he follows the principle, "the best writer for each article," though he has found that in certain cases the man and the subject go together, so that there is no other man for the subject, and no other subject for the man. In consequence, the first volume contains articles by not less than one hundred and ninety-five authors, one hundred and thirty-five of whom have contributed but a single article each. On looking over the various headings, the reader will feel quite convinced that it would be easier to enumerate the topics not contained in the work than those described in it. Its comprehensiveness and its fulness render the work a handy and almost necessary reference book for the pulpit orator, the platform speaker, the professor, and the writer, in fact for all who profess to instruct their fellowmen in morality or religion. It is understood that the Catholic reader will have to be prepared to eliminate those views expressed in the work which are not compatible with Catholic moral and religious principles.

Among the publications of a general character on the history of religion, we may mention also: (1) certain articles in the *Revue d'histoire des religions,* e. g. the account of the pertinent transactions of the Congress of Orientalists, held in Algiers, 19-26 April, 1905 (LII, 78-84); (2) the *Bulletin de science des religions,*[2] compiled by several writers and going back in its bibliography to 1906, though the *Revue* prefers to consider the religion of Israel under the heading of *Biblical Religion;* (3) H. Nissen's work entitled *Orientation,*[3] though Biblical questions are not directly discussed in it; (4) Mr. A. Lang's work entitled *The Secret of the Totem* (London, 1905); (5) Bertholet's *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch,*[4] which appears to be a joint publication of several editors; (6)

[2] *Revue des sciences Théol. et phil.* I. 540-586.

[3] Studien zur Geschichte der Religion. Berlin, 1907: Weidmann. Hft. I. & II.

[4] Tübingen, 1907.

two articles contributed by Mignot to *Le Correspondant* in connexion with the question of the history of religion;[5] (7) Turchi's *Bollettino di storia delle religioni.*[6]

II. Religion of Israel. The religion of Israel has attracted the attention of many serious inquirers during the course of the last few years. W. Robertson Smith has published a volume bristling with detail of rare erudition;[7] but it deals almost exclusively with sacrifice, gives little information about the Babylonian religion, and exaggerates the importance of Totemism in the history of religion. Mr. Jevons has exploited this last feature in his explanation of the relation between a god and his people; the bond is strong enough to make the people cling to its god, even if he appears to have abandoned them. Totemism has been reduced to a more proper position in the history of religion by Stanley A. Cook in an article entitled *Israel and Totemism* contributed to the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for April, 1902. — Baethgen's *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte* might be most useful to the student of the history of religion, if the author had not confined himself too much to the analysis of the idea of god.—On the whole, it is doubtful whether the Catholic reader will be able to find a more competent and satisfactory book on the subject than Father Lagrange's *Études sur les religions sémitiques.*[8] We may mention here, however, the works published by E. König,[9] Dujardin,[10] E. Guiraud,[11] and J. Goldschidt.[12] In the following pages we shall classify our

[5] L'Eglise et la science, 10 Dec., 1907; la Bible et les religions, 25 Dec., 1907.

[6] Rivista storico-critica delle scienze teologiche, III. 945 ff.

[7] Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. First Series. New Edit. London, 1907: Black.

[8] Paris, 1905.

[9] Moderne Anschauungen über den Ursprung der israelitischen Religion; Langensalza, 1906: Beyer.

[10] La source du fleuve chrétien. I. Le Judaisme; Paris, 1906: Ed. de Mercure de France.

[11] Essai de recherches des idées universalistes dans la religion d'Israel et principalement chez les prophètes d'après l'AT.; Montauban, 1907.

[12] Das Judentum in der Religionsgeschichte der Menschheit; Frankf. a. M., 1907: Kauffmann.

references to some of the more recent publications on the history of religion according to their connexion with the theory of evolution, the mythical theory, the psychological theory, and the fact of a primitive revelation.

1. *The Theory of Evolution.* The Theory of Evolution or Development may be said to be the system of the Biblical critics who follow the lead of Wellhausen. Its clearest expression is found probably in M. A. Perrochet's inaugural address delivered 16 October, 1907, before the Academy of Neuchâtel.[13] The speaker clearly distinguishes the various steps in the development of monotheism: first, the Israelites adhered to animism; then, they acknowledged tribal gods; these were compounded by Moses into a national god belonging to the whole people; after the people had occupied Palestine, the national god became also a territorial god or a god of nature; the prophets were impelled by the destruction of the people to separate the god from the nation and make him the God of the world, endowing him with certain ethical qualities; the Jewry after Ezechiel relapsed into its nationalism; finally, Jesus Christ continued and completed the work of the prophets. But M. Perrochet is commendable only for his clearness of exposition; he advances no new argument.—Another recent exposition of the Development Theory may be found in Prof. Delitzsch's two lectures on this subject.[14] Starting with Emperor William's letter to Admiral Hollmann, Delitzsch professes to be an adherent of the religion of Lessing's Nathan. The sacerdotal religion of the Old Testament was developed by the prophets, and especially by Jesus Christ; Delitzsch does not hesitate to claim a degree of coöperation in this development for himself, since he has brought back Christianity to its original form by stripping it of Christ's virginal birth and divinity, of the dogma of the Trinity, and of the Eucharistic sacrifice. The writer repeats several of his statements found in his *Babel-Bibel* lectures without adding any new argument. We need not warn the reader that Prof. Delitzsch would be

[13] Neuchâtel, 1908: Attinger.

[14] Zur Weiterbildung der Religion; Stuttgart, 1908: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

the first to object against any Christian apology written after his own method.

W. E. Addis too has published a work entitled *Hebrew Religion to the Establishment of Judaism under Ezra,*[15] but he has found able opponents in Messrs. Hutton, Orr, and Wiener. The critique of Hutton, entitled *Hebrew Religion,* may be found in the *Liberal Churchman* for January, 1907; Prof. Orr points out that Prof. Addis's book is wholly based on the priniciples of modern criticism which are uncertain in themselves and cannot claim the unanimous endorsement of the critics;[16] H. M. Wiener's pamphlet entitled *Notes on Hebrew Religion* is a reprint from the *Churchman,* March, April, May, 1907, and urges against Prof. Addis the theory that there was only one sanctuary in Israel, though there were many altars.[17] In an article contributed to the *Bibliotheca Sacra,*[18] the same writer attacks the critical Development Theory as represented by Kuenen; investigating the earliest indications of monotheism, he points out vestiges of God the creator even in the pre-prophetic documents.—C. von Orelli writes against the extreme theory of religious development from a Protestant conservative point of view;[19] he protests against an evolution of monolatry into monotheism. Besides, the peculiar character of the Biblical religion is clear from the fact, that a personal founder enters as an element into its development, that a personal God reveals himself, who is the God for the individual as well as for the community, and whose union with each believer has become most personal through Christ, whose work consists not merely in a set of teaching but also in his death of expiation. Another Protestant writer defends the absolute character of the Christian religion against the idea that the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Reformation represent only relative steps in the development of religion.[20]

[15] London, 1906: Williams.
[16] Expository Times, XVIII. 119.
[17] London, 1907: Stock.
[18] LXIV. 609-637.
[19] Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen, II. 12, 39; Gross-Lichterfelde, 1906: Runge.
[20] Die absolute Offenbarung und die religionsgeschichtliche Betrachtungsweise: Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, LXXX. 43-45.

2. *The Mythical Theory.* The Mythical Theory, as we understand it in this paragraph, is the system of Winckler. He maintains that mythology, both in its general features and in its detail, is everywhere the same.[21] Moreover, it is everywhere of an astral character, and as such it is of Babylonian origin. Not that Mythology is represented by Winckler as the primitive religion; it is rather an explanation of the world which adapted itself more or less to the preëxisting religion. The religious starting-point, or the state of religion at the time when mythology was engrafted upon it, must be regarded as occupying a rather high level. The divinity was a spiritual power which revealed itself in the course of the stars and in other sensible phenomena. The stars were not the divinity, but they manifested the divine ideas and wishes. The earth, being a perfect counterpart of the heavens, reflected those same divine concepts and intentions; hence every region of the earth had for its divine master him who was lord of the corresponding part of heaven. This relation apparently necessitates a prevailing polytheism; but often the different gods are really equivalents of the same divine being, indicating only the different actions of the same divine power. When did this system originate? Winckler dates it back into about the sixth millennium B. C. For the principal god of Lower Chaldea is Sin, the moon-god; according to the monuments only the third month after the vernal equinox is sacred to him; but when the system originated, the month sacred to Sin must have coincided with the vernal equinox.

Winckler claims that this system of astral religious mythology was propagated everywhere, though space will not allow us here to enter into the details of the consecutive religious developments. Two considerations present themselves immediately which render the theory unsatisfactory: first, before the astral mythology was engrafted on the existing religion, there must have existed a philosophical explanation of the world as well as a religion; does not this lead us back to

[21] Himmels- und Weltenbild der Babylonier als Grundlage der Weltanschauung und Mythologie aller Völker, Leipzig, 1901.

animism or a similar system? Secondly, Winckler will find it difficult to explain in a satisfactory way the revolting religious myths concerning Zeus and Ishtar transforming themselves into different animals. It is not surprising, therefore, to see that K. Marti rejects Winckler's hypothesis as a piece of Kabbalistic wisdom;[22] still, he has been influenced by the mythical theory sufficiently, to pay close attention to the relation between the religion of Israel and that of other nations. Winckler, on his part, critizes Marti's work rather severely in a pamphlet written against the assumptions of Wellhausen's theory.[23]—B. Baentsch shows himself a disciple of Winckler in his work entitled *Altorientalischer und israelitischer Monotheismus;*[24] according to Baentsch, Egyptian and Babylonian monotheism must have influenced Israel's religion at the time of the patriarchs; Moses must have followed the same influence, though he could not feel himself called to be a religious founder, until he had learned to know Yahweh by his inner experience. W. Stark considers this work as a most important publication, especially on account of its opposition to the prevailing schools of literary criticism and evolution.[25] On the other hand, Baentsch's book is not radical enough to merit the approbation of J. C. Matthes;[26] he objects to the writer's assumption of the Mosaic character of the decalogue, of several other historical facts, and to his methods of arguing. We may mention here also the works of Goldstein,[27] and F. J. Foakes-Jackson.[28]

3. *Wundt's Theory.* Prof. Wundt's theory is based on the principles he lays down in his work entitled *Völkerpsycho-*

[22] Geschichte der israelitischen Religion. Strassburg, 1907: Bull. Fifth edit.

[23] Religionsgeschichtler und geschichtlicher Orient; Leipzig, 1906: Hinrichs.

[24] Tübingen, 1906: Mohr. [25] Die christliche Welt, XX. n. 28.

[26] Jahvisme en monotheisme: Teylers theologisch Tijdschrift, V. 303-335.

[27] Der Monotheismus Kanaans; Globus LXXXIX. 234 f.

[28] Foreign Influence on Israel's Development. Interpreter, III, 55-69; 126-140.

logie.[29] The author treats in this book of myth and religion, of vision and prophecy, of the belief in the existence of a soul and its worship, of primitive animism and questions of a similar character. It may be true that he tells us nothing new, but he takes man as he finds him either in the present or the past, either as an individual or as the member of a nation. His faculties and aspirations, his physical and social surroundings are weighed according to their respective value, and if it be kept in mind that these various elements are studied not merely in the individual but also in the nation, it is perhaps not wrong to identify Prof. Wundt's psychology with Father Lagrange's anthropology. This renders a comparative study of the history of religion necessary. Among those who follow Wundt's system we may name J. Köberle;[30] he rejects the mythological theory by distinguishing between pseudo-myths and the real formative source of the cosmogony in the Book of Genesis. The cosmogony is too independent to be taken from other nations; it embraces a complete system of religious facts, while the theory of astral myths implies the development of mythology into a scientific system.—Perhaps Mr. M. Peisker's work may be mentioned in this connexion.[31] The author writes against the assumption of an Israelitic henotheism, showing that even the most ancient sources reveal a simple monotheism which finds Yahweh's sovereignty over the whole world and all nations compatible with the existence of special gods for the pagan nations. The writer shows that the assumed existence of such gods is not a step to the admission of the universal God, but rather a correction of the original belief that Yahweh is the lord of the Gentiles too.

4. *Primitive Revelation.* It must not be believed that the

[29] Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythus, und Sitte; Leipzig, 1906: Engelmann.

[30] Orientalische Mythologie: Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, XVII. 838-859; 897-921.

[31] Die Beziehungen der Nichtisraeliten zu Jahwe nach der Anschauung der altisraelitischen Quellenschriften, Beih. zur Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, Nr. XII., Giessen, 1907: Töpelmann.

writers we are about to enumerate under the heading of Primitive Revelation represent this fact as the only element entering into the history of the religion of Israel. It is true that some Catholic writers have simplified the problem excessively: according to them, God revealed himself in the beginning; hence monotheism is the primitive religion of the human race, and the religious history of the non-Jewish races is only the record of a continuous decadence. The Bible teaches, indeed, that God revealed himself to primitive man, but it does not attest that primitive man received a system of metaphysics or a civilization directly from God. Strip man of his civilization, of his culture, of all scientific knowledge; leave him his natural faculties, not as yet corrupted by evil habits; grant him, too, a revealed knowledge of God; this is all the Bible teaches us of the primitive religious condition of humanity. We are not told that monotheism always continued unadulterated in some portion of the human race; we are not informed about the history of the religious decadence of man; when the Bible speaks of the origin of polytheism, it marks out only two of its objects; the dead, and the forces of nature. It is clear, therefore, that even if primitive revelation be admitted, the question of the religious condition of successive generations of men may be solved in various ways. It is on this account that the reader may find it of interest to learn how some of our recent Catholic writers have handled this subject.

A writer who signs himself *Un professeur de Grand Séminaire* [32] proceeds on the assumption of the critical view of history. According to him, the three fundamental ideas of the prophets are: Yahweh's relations to Israel; the true worship of Yahweh; the Messianic hopes. Prophetic religion appears to be summed up in these three elements.—Hehn [33] is convinced that Wellhausen's Development Theory requires too much *a priori* construction; at the same time, he does not

[32] Annales de Philosophie chrétienne, 4 S., II. 161-175.

[33] Köln. Volksz., 1907, Lit. Beil. Nr. 7.

claim to be a simple follower of Winckler; the similarity between the Biblical religion and that of Babylon consists in mere likeness of external form, without affecting the data of the Bible.—P. Boylan [34] maintains that the recent school of Assyriologists is opposed to the Theory of Development; Israel is regarded as being placed in the current of oriental civilization with monotheistic undercurrents; the writer attempts to undo Biblical criticism by a process of discredit.—A. Dufourq [35] appears to have published the first part of his work with a view of attracting such readers as are favorably inclined towards Christianity. The past history of religion is made an apologetic argument for the future of the Christian religion. The writer constructs the history of the Jewish religion out of progressive Catholic and non-Catholic sources. Deuteronomy is according to him the basis of the reform introduced by Josias; the priestly document of the Pentateuch is assigned to the time of Ezechiel; the latter part of Isaias is attributed to a Deutero-Isaias.—F. X. Kortleitner [36] proves that monotheism is the primitive religion in the light of revelation and history; he studies the time and manner of the origin of polytheism, the various kinds of polytheism, and its existence among different nations.—J. Nikel [37] investigates the various attempts of accounting for the religion of the Old Testament without admitting the existence of a supernatural revelation; Israel's monotheism has not been taken over from other nations, nor does it retain any vestiges of lower degrees of religious development.—Space forbids us to consider in this article the minor elements in the history of the religion of Israel, such as Yahwism, the Aaronic priesthood, the sanctuary, the Messianic hope, and its relation to Christianity.

[34] Irish Theological Quarterly, II. 35-54.

[35] L'avenir du christianisme; Paris, 1908: Bloud.

[36] De polytheismo universo et quibusdam eius formis apud Hebræos finitimasque gentes usitatis; Innsbruck, 1908: Wagner.

[37] Der Ursprung des alt. Gottesglaubens; Münster, 1908: Aschendorff.

Criticisms and Notes.

A STUDY IN AMERICAN FREEMASONRY. By Arthur Preuss, Editor of the "Catholic Fortnightly Review." St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1908. Pp. xiv-433.

LE PLAN DE LA FRANC-MACONNERIE EN ITALIE ET EN FRANCE, OU LA CLEF DE L'HISTOIRE DEPUIS 40 ANS. Par Léon Dehon, D.D., LL.D. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1908. Pp. 103.

Mr. Preuss is well aware of the fact that a study in Freemasonry has to face a more or less explicit prejudice in the mind of its readers. "We have known many Masons," the latter are not unlikely to say, "we have known them intimately and have found them excellent men, good fathers, faithful husbands, loyal citizens; honest and upright in their dealings; open-handed in their generous benevolence; friends even of the Catholic clergy, who never appealed to them for assistance in vain; respected by all, and an honor to the community in which they lived. Such are many of the Masons whom we have known and from the mouths of whom we have learned the nature and the aims of the Masonic Order. That they knew these aims needs no stronger proof than the long years they have lived as Masons, having indeed held the higher, if not the highest, degrees in the Fraternity; that they told us the truth is witnessed to by the integrity and sincerity of their character" (p. 1). That this favorable estimate of Freemasonry is widespread even amongst intelligent Catholics experienced priests know but too well. When such Catholics are asked to explain the condemnation placed by the Church upon the organization, they are either puzzled for an answer, or they distinguish between Latin and English, including American, Freemasonry, and opine that the condemnation refers principally to the former and only secondarily, by a kind of entailment, to the latter, recognizing as they do the anti-Christian tendency of the one, but not of the other.

Another attitude of mind irreceptive of a critical study of the subject is the suspicion, if not the conviction, that the attempted criticisms are not based on authentic sources, and consequently not on accurate information regarding the real nature and purposes of Freemasonry. The recollection of the Leo Taxil and Diana Vaughan trickery whereby so many were duped

into believing as true what proved to be utterly fictitious horrors attributed to the Lodge, has engendered a general scepticism regarding the anti-Christian tendencies of Freemasonry, and has fostered the belief that Catholic writers are apt to impute such tendencies upon inadequate evidence.

For whatever reason, however, the reader into whose hands the two books here under notice may fall, should be sceptical as to the real purpose of Freemasonry, he will very probably lay aside his doubt after perusing the works in question. Both writers base their study on documents avowed as authoritative by the craft itself. Both writers educe from those documents evidence that should convince the fair mind of the anti-Christian aim of essential Freemasonry. Both writers prove that the distinction between Latin and English Freemasonry is only on the surface; that it does not touch the essentials of the organization; that Freemasonry is radically one the world over.

Mr. Preuss has made a thorough study of American Freemasonry, from every point of view—historical, theoretical, practical; and his book is as intensely interesting as it is vitally important and timely. The outcome of the study is in his own words the following: Masonry is one everywhere, not in rite, for such unity is merely accidental; nor in jurisdiction, for this, likewise, is a mere matter of convenience; nor one among its *exoteric* members, for these are ill-instructed—and indeed at some stages of initiation intentionally deceived—as to the doctrines of the craft; but it is one in its true and *esoteric* spirit; it is one in its aim and object; one in its light and doctrines; one in its philosophy and religion; thus forming one family, one craft, one institution, one brotherhood, one order, one world, aiming in its catholicity to substitute itself for the Catholicity established by Christ (p. 411). A grave charge, surely, but one for which the book adduces very strong evidence.

After perusing the *Study of American Freemasonry* the reader will do well to take up the plan of Freemasonry in Italy and France which Dr. Dehon outlines in the little French brochure indicated above. Here he will find further authentic evidence corroborative of the statement that the essential fraternity is one the world over. But, besides this, he will find what at least is indirect evidence for the fact that the plan of persecution against

Christianity recently raging in France was inaugurated forty years ago in the Lodges of Italy. The *sociétés cultuelles* did not spring from the supple brain of M. Briand. The laicization of the Church was secretly projected by the Italian Freemasons and publicly presented in the Italian parliament. The first project was put forward before the latter legislative body in 1864 by Minghetti; a second in 1871 was proposed by Minghetti and Peruzzi before the royal commission; and a third project, more detailed and exact, was devised by Cadorna in 1887. It was only the strong opposition of the Catholic press, seconding the pronouncements of Pius IX and Leo XIII, that frustrated the Masonic attempts to secularize the organization of the churches in Italy; but, as M. Dehon pointedly puts it: *Les croyants ont vu clair . . . en Italie. En France . . . pas tous.* The evidence presented by the author for the Masonic origin of the Italian scheme is rather indirect than direct. He proves from reliable sources that the recent French plan of persecution, which is identical with the preceding Italian one, was concocted by the Freemasons, and he leaves one to infer from identity of character and purpose the identity of origin. The inference is of course not necessitated, though highly probable. The argument would have been more cogent had there been direct evidence presented for the distinctively and officially Masonic origin of the Italian scheme. There is, however, no reasonable ground for uncertainty respecting the Masonic origin of the French program and not the slightest ground for doubt regarding the universal identity of the essence and aim of Freemasonry.

THE SEEMING UNREALITY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE By Henry Churchill King. New York, London, Bombay: The Macmillan Co. 1908. Pp. viii-256.

The author of this book — the President of Oberlin College, Ohio, where he had previously been for some years professor of theology and, before that, of philosophy—may be known to the present reader through several former works treating of philosophico-theological subjects. In the present volume he endeavors, first, to solve the problem, why the Spiritual Life seems to many persons unreal, and, secondly, to show how that life may be made to seem real. By the Spiritual Life he means "the conviction of the fact of the Christian God and of our personal

relation to him, with all that is most directly involved in these convictions" (p. 8). If the existence of God and our personal relations to Him are "facts," why is it that the "conviction" disappears from, or does not enter at all into, the minds of so many? and why does it fluctuate so greatly in the minds wherein it has a lodgment? Surely, a vitally important problem is here proposed.

It is not, of course, in any sense a new problem, nor is Dr. King's the first solution that has been offered. Long ago and often have books been written on the causes of unbelief and the decay of faith, subjects identical with that of the present volume. The French especially have, times beyond count, shown *pourquoi on ne crois pas*. Nevertheless, the problem with its difficulty is forever looming up and it is well that it should be answered again and again. Dr. King's answers are on the whole persuasive. They do not go very deeply into the matter, but they are suggestive and ought to convince a willing mind. They have a ring of sincerity and restrained earnestness about them which adds something to their impressiveness. The author is better at analyzing than at synthesizing; better at pointing out the reasons why the spiritual life does not convince men of its realness than in pointing out the way to conviction.

The second part of his book—The Way into Reality—will hardly convince a mind that is not otherwise already convinced. The appeal for the reality of God and our relation to Him is based entirely on feeling, subjective experience. At the very most and, indeed, for that matter, the whole of it, is, on the author's own showing, simply a system of more or less probable reasoning: for, as he once and again declares, "outside of mathematics we are limited to probable reasoning" (pp. 39 and 199). It need hardly be subjoined as a minor proposition to the latter proposition as the major—"But, Mr. King's book is all outside of mathematics." Therefore its reasoning is all only probable. Repeatedly he insists that the existence of God cannot be proved (pp. 200, 204, 208, 209, etc.). How then shall man come to a personal conviction of the realness of the spiritual life? By communion with Christ, who was in abiding communion with God. But how know we that Christ existed? By historical documents. Now these deal with concrete facts. But of concrete facts we can have no demonstration, only probability

(p. 39). Therefore, it is only probable that Christ existed. Now over against an opinion that is only probable the contradictory is also probable. Therefore, it is probable that Christ did not exist. As to the older and the deeper question, *What think you of Christ? whose Son is He?* we find no definite answer in the book before us. Why should we be convinced of the truth of our Lord's teaching? Not by appealing as He did Himself to His work, His mastery over nature, over life and death; but by appealing to a feeling that we have that His feeling was right. So, too, "our faith in immortality [and correspondingly in any other spiritual truth] is built directly upon Christ, just because of the spirit of His life. He seems Himself to live in the very atmosphere of the assurance of immortality, in the atmosphere of eternity. He expects it. He cannot be disappointed, we feel. But more than that, eternity fits into that most perfect life of trust and love. It is harmonious with it. His life seems to us to have an eternal quality. We cannot think of it as of merely temporary significance. It must abide" (p. 240). This pragmatic standpoint underlies especially the second part of the book. The author does not seem to recognize the danger, one does not like to call it the fallacy of arguing from consequent to antecedent, any more than he apprehends the weakness of an appeal to so fluctuating a phenomenon as feeling for a criterion of reality and truth.

PHILOSOPHIA MORALIS. Auctore C. Willems, S. Th. D., Ph. D., Philosophiae in Sem. Trevirensi Professore. Treveris: ex officino ad. S. Paulinum. 1908. Pp. xv-584.

SUMMULA PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE ad usum adolescentium, a J. S. Hickey O. Cist. concinnata. Vol. I. Logica et Ontologia. Ed. altera. Dublini: Browne et Nolan. (New York: Benziger Brothers.) 1908. Pp. xxii-462.

The two volumes in which the Logic and Metaphysics of Dr. Willems's course in Philosophy are comprised were published some two years ago (Institutiones Philosophicae, I-II Vols. Treviris). They were at once welcomed by those best competent to judge as a highly valuable contribution to the literature of their class. Their value was found to consist in the solidity of their teaching, the perfection of their method, and especially in the application they make of "the old philosophy" to the physical

sciences and the course of contemporary speculation. The present volume, devoted to Ethics, formed no part of the author's original program, as appears from the fact that he treats the fundamental moral problem—that of human fidelity—in Metaphysics. Fortunately, however, he was persuaded to add this portion. But for it not only would a very excellent work have been left without its roof and crown, but students of philosophy would have missed the learning and the wisdom here brought to bear upon a number of vitally important topics. There is, it is true, no lack of Latin manuals of philosophy, moral as well as mental; but there are few, if any, such works in which so many ethical problems are discussed with so much knowledge of facts and theories, and with such profound weight, as is the case with the volume at hand.

Here, as in the preceding portions of the work, the author has succeeded in treating the *nova et vetera amico foedere*, and there is evidence throughout that he has taken account of the history of ethics and the moral, social, economic, and political conditions and legislation of the present time. The note of "actuality" is struck at the very outset. The opening question concerns the origin of moral ideas. Having treated previously, as was said above, of the final end of man, the author is free to enter upon his subject analytically—to investigate at once the source of moral phenomena. He thus puts himself in touch with the legitimate tendency of modern ethical study, that is to approach it by the gateway of empirical psychology. And this same note of actuality, which continues throughout the work, is finally sounded at the closing, where the urgent questions of politics and economics — the social question — are ably discussed. A searching critic might come upon an occasional trace of what might be called ultra-conservatism, as, for instance, where the author appears to allow for no evolution in moral ideas (p. 19); but attentive reading will show that he has weighed all sides of his subject, and if he holds firm to a traditional truth, it is because the balancing evidence stands first with the *truth*, while *tradition* is secondary and confirmatory. Not the least merit of the author's entire work is the well-grounded confidence in the strength of Catholic philosophy with which it inspires the younger student. The latter, when studying text-books of the kind, is not unfrequently tempted to suspect that his author has not prop-

erly heard the *altera pars*. He need have no suspicion in reading the present work. There are sufficient patent indications to the contrary.

We might call attention to a slight typographical error not mentioned in the *corrigenda*. By a misplacement of the reference sign at page 314, the works of Henry George are attributed to Alfred Wallace.

It is gratifying to be able to announce here that the first volume of Father Hickey's *Summula of Philosophy* has recently appeared in a second edition. The book has been notably enlarged and amended and well indexed. For the rest, as the first edition was previously reviewed in these pages, it will suffice to direct attention to the improved form of a work that commends itself as a model manual in virtue of its comprehensiveness, succinctness, perspicuity of method and style, and especially for the literary apparatus in English with which it illustrates and develops the Latin text.

HISTORY OF ECONOMICS, or Economics as a Factor in the Making of History. By the Rev. J. A. Dewe, A. M. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1908. Pp. 334.

In no department of human inquiry so patently as in that of history is the Virgilian dictum exemplified: *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*. Happy indeed is he who is able to discern and systematize the causes that explain his own personal life; and next to his—if not greater than his—is the happiness of him who has succeeded in dissociating and coördinating the factors that constitute and effect the infinitely complex life of the nation —still more of the race, whereof he is a tiny, however important, fragment or cell. The happiness in both cases is proportionate of course to the difficulty overcome by the effort of research. To say that happiness may be reached by reading the present volume is overstating the thing. It will be nearer the truth to venture the prophecy that the attentive reader will be greatly helped on the way. Let him not fix his mind, however, on the first half of the title, for, should he look to the work for a full history of economics, he may not be satisfied. To answer this a weightier volume were needed. Let him rather seek in it suggestions on the causal influence of economics in the effor-

mation of national life, and he will get more of what he is looking for.

The author rightly deems it that the countless causes that go to shape the history of humanity are reducible to three—religion, physical environment, and methods of producing wealth. The latter cause he entitles economics—although he indicates that the term signifies the science or theory of wealth-making and getting rather than the actual process—and to the influence of this factor he devotes his study. He traces the influence throughout the ancient, medieval, and modern periods of history. Economics has the unenviable reputation of being the dismal science; but the story of man's struggles for livelihood and of the results of those struggles in shaping his social and political life—the story at least as told in the present book—retains none of the repellent features of economic theorizings. The author has succeeded in making it both instructive and interesting. The latter feature would probably have been still more pronounced by a little more attention given to verbal details,—by an effort to avoid the repetition of the same word in consecutive lines. Notable instances of such repetitions are very frequent. Aside from this trifling dictional flaw the work is deserving of praise and commendation. Much has been written by non-Christian and by anti-Christian writers on the economic interpretation of history. Father Dewe's, we believe, is the first work by a Catholic author on the subject.

SERMONS. By the Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D. Edited by the Rev. J. H. Cronenberger, C.S.Sp. Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey. 1908. Pp. xiv.-462.

SERMONS ON MODERN SPIRITUALISM. By A. V. Miller, O.S.C. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1908. Pp. xv.-178.

PENTECOST PREACHING. By the Rev. Arthur Devine, C.P. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1908. Pp. 306.

INSTRUCTIONS SUR LES FÊTES DE L'ANNÉE. Par M. l'Abbé Morisot. Paris: P. Téqui. Vol. I, pp. 379; Vol. II, pp. 421.

LES PÉCHÉS CAPITAUX. Par M. l'Abbé Laborie. Paris: P. Téqui. 1908. Pp. 247.

Those who know the late Dr. Parsons's *Studies in Church History* will doubtless welcome his recent posthumous volume

of sermons; for, although the endowments or mental acquirements of the historian do not necessarily guarantee the value of his oratorical productions, nevertheless the very fact that so laborious an investigator and so voluminous an author as was Dr. Parsons, thought it worth while to spend so much of his precious time in writing out in full his sermons and religious instructions, may be taken as presumptive proof of their value. The presumption grows into conviction as one peruses the collection at hand. The discourses number forty-three, and cover a wide range of subjects—ethical, theological, liturgical, historical, social, miscellaneous. None of them is long; some are very short; all are suggestive—not such as the preacher will memorize, but such as will give him some good thoughts which he can easily transmute into his own mental substance and make him want to give them utterance. There is a quaint little "talk" on "Dress." It is just four pages long, and the reviewer feels what he has even now said—he would like to give the whole of it utterance. Spatial limitations, however, forbid. The discourses comprised in the present volume are all that were found amongst Dr. Parsons's papers. It is a matter for regret that many others have been lost. Doubtless these will be prized both for their authorship and for their intrinsic value—a quality to which, it may not be superfluous to add, the bookmaker's art has given appropriate recognition.

To what degree it is desirable or necessary to preach to our people on Spiritualism it is impossible to determine. Much depends on locality and other circumstances. Perhaps now and again, here or there, at least an instruction on the subject may be called for. At all events a source of useful information and suggestion in this direction will be found in Father Miller's course of six sermons. Besides, a succinct presentation of the nature and tendencies of spiritualism is sometimes wanted to put in the hands of lay persons who may be tempted to gratify a morbid craving for the occult. In such case, also, the present book will prove helpful. The author shows not only the ordinary book knowledge of the subject; he likewise gives some of his own personal observations of the malign consequences of spiritistic practices.

Father Devine is well known to the clergy as the author of a number of useful books of instruction on the Creed, the Commandments, the Sacraments, as well as by his learned treatises on Ascetical and on Mystical Theology. The sermons comprised in his recent volume deserve their title "instructive"—to which may justly be added solid, clear, practical, methodical. The latter quality is especially prominent. The clear-cut synopsis prefixed to each will enable the busy preacher to take in the discourse at a glance. A rapid perusal, if need be, of the sermon, and another survey of the synopsis ought to equip the hurried sermon-searcher, when unable, for one cause or another, to think out his own discourse.

There is an abundance of preachable material in the Abbé Morisot's two volumes of instructions. He has two, usually three, sometimes four, discourses, for each of the principal festivals and devotional days of the year. The discourses average six pages each—a fair length; the thought is adequately developed, and well illustrated; the style is clear, and the matter easily assimilated. A brief summary prefixed to each discourse facilitates the latter process.

The Abbé Laborie's volume contains fifteen sermons or conferences on the capital sins. The discourses are written primarily for men. They are well reasoned out, solid, and at the same time practical. The roots of sin, the vicious forces at work in human nature, bring havoc, not only into the individual person, but also into society—domestic and civil. The present sermons are directed against this twofold disorder. They will be helpful to the priest who is called upon to address associations of men.

Literary Chat.

The *Ave Maria* Press has issued a new edition of Charles Warren Stoddard's graphic description of that singular settlement known as *The Lepers of Molokai*. The volume is beautifully printed and bound, which is an additional inducement for many to read and to wish that others might read the wonderful story of suffering and sacrifice portrayed in Prof. Stoddard's beautiful language.

Father F. X. Lasance has conceived the new and fruitful idea of making a bright thing out of a prayerbook. He calls his volume *My Prayer Book: Happiness in Goodness;* and he verifies the title by offering to the devout reader a number of Reflections, Counsels, Prayers, and Devotions, which all tend to set forth with more or less distinctness the thought that to be charitable is to be happy, and that to make others happy is to be charitable. Apart from this aim the author follows out the maxim of seeking to find the beautiful in truth wherever it meets us, whether on Christian or on pagan ground. It is just a little unusual to find Byron quoted in a prayerbook, but the thought that joy and happiness are twin gifts is Catholic after all.

The recent celebration of the centenary of Mount Saint Mary's College was in many ways a remarkable demonstration of the influence which an ecclesiastical institution exercises upon the healthy educational development of a community in the various spheres of professional and literary as well as theological activity. The addresses, sermons, and poems which the occasion called forth and which give testimony to an excellent *esprit de corps* among the alumni of the college, are printed in the November issue of the *Mountaineer* (a centennial number), together with some illustrations that give the reader a good idea of what this venerable College and its faculties have stood for, and still represent with a fine classic grace.

Father Meschler, S.J., author of a Life of Christ and a volume on the Holy Ghost, already translated into English, completes in the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* a well-balanced and critical study of the "Ascetical Principles of St. Ignatius". The writer takes occasion to point out how utterly misleading are the pyschological tests applied by non-Catholics who attempt to interpret what lies entirely beyond the reach of their spiritual comprehension. Another article in the same number which has a kindred aim and throws much light upon the modern estimate of Catholic asceticism, is that by P. Zimmerman, S.J., on the *Value of Sanctity* according to the modern pragmatic standard of judgment. It goes to the root of the Modernist theory and deals with it in a logical and thoroughly satisfactory style. (B. Herder, St. Louis.)

The two latest contributions from American writers to the *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law,* edited by the faculty of Political Science in Columbia University, are *The Enforcement of the Statutes of Laborers* during the first decade after the Black Death, 1349-1359, by Bertha Haven Putnam, of Mount Holyoke College; and *The Province of New Jersey,* by Prof. Edwin Tanner, of Syracuse University. (Longmans, Green & Co., New York City.)

Biblische Zeitschrift (VI, 4) brings certain interesting reflections on the value of a new edition of Sabatier's *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae, seu Vetus Italica,* last printed during the middle of the

eighteenth century in Rheims and Paris. There is also a good paper on "St. Jerome and the Hebrew Original of St. Matthew's Gospel". (B. Herder.)

Those who keep in touch with the theological literature in France know what a large part of it has recently been concerned with the act of faith. Many books and pamphlets have appeared on the subject, while the principal reviews have been flooded with the pertinent controversies. The cause of it, or at least the occasion, has been of course the precipitation of "the new apologetic", some dozen years ago, by M. Blondel. Naturally there is no end of repetition of the same things by the different writers, but out of it all there has undoubtedly resulted a fuller and more critical knowledge of the natural elements of faith. At least, such knowledge has become more widespread. A little book, entitled *La Foi et l'Acte de Foi*, written some ten years ago by M. Blainvel, a professor of theology at the Catholic Institute (Paris), and recently appearing in a new edition from the publisher Lethielleux (Paris), gives a very good analysis of the subject. It is not polemical, hardly touches explicitly on the recent controversies; but it is a solid and luminous piece of constructive theology.

Closely related to the foregoing subject is the *Bibliothèque Apologetique*, a series of neat, handy volumes, each treating solidly, yet within the limits of the average intelligent reader, of some subject of faith or the preambles thereto. A recent edition to the series (the fourth) is a study of the Gospel of the Infancy (*L'Enfance de Jésus Christ d'après les Évangiles*) by Père Durand, S.J. It contains an able defence of the opening chapters of St. Matthew and of St. Luke. But the chief value of the work is its thorough vindication of the Virginal Birth of our Lord against the attacks especially of recent rationalists. There is also a good dissertation (pp. 219-276) on the *Fratres Domini* mentioned in the Gospels and the Acts. The whole study is critical and well documented.

The sixth volume of the *Bibliothèque* is entitled *Psychologie de l'Incroyant*, by M. Xavier Moisant. The author holds that the really typical infidel falls more or less fully under one or other of the three groups: the scoffer, the positivist, the intellectualist; and of this triplet Voltaire, Comte, and Renouvier stand before the world as the most striking representatives. M. Moisant draws from the works of these typical unbelievers a picture of their personality. The study is analytically psychological and inductive. The apologetical import is implicit and is left to the reader to draw out—namely, we suppose, that the inner life of the typical infidel, as revealed by its utterances, has in its totality no weight against faith such as the life of the believer presents in favor of faith. The book is persuasive and highly interesting, though one who is not French will probably skip over some of the extracts from that leering cynic, Voltaire—extracts, however, necessary to make the portrait sufficiently complete for the author's purpose.

The latest edition to the foregoing series bears the title, "The Need and Duty of Religion" (*La Besoin et le Devoir Religieux*), by Maurice Sérol. It is a psychological study of the basis of religion. It shows that tne radical tendencies of man's nature can reach their complement only in and by religion; and since the analysis of these tendencies, confirmed by experience, proves that nothing within the natural order is adequate to complete them, by affording them their proportionate objects, man is necessitated to seek beyond: hence also to believe in the supernatural, a belief which will by inherent impulse express itself in external forms and symbolic rites. From the natural and supernatural necessity of religion—faith and its outward expression—the author infers the *duty* of religion as being the means necessary in order to satisfy the radical needs of man's nature. The argument thus put may seem to glide over too easily from the natural to the supernatural order, and to prove too much by making the latter necessary to the former. However, as the argument is drawn out by the author himself, the connexion between the two orders seems to be satisfactorily effected. Although the general line of thought is not new, it is presented with characteristically French clarity and attractiveness.

Books of extracts from the great writers abroad, superabound, and not less so in French than in English. Still they do good. They distribute the spiritual wealth of the spiritually rich. This is surely the case with a little book of excerpts from Bossuet, entitled *Doctrine Spirituelle.* To say anything here in commendation of the profound and beautiful teaching of the great prelate were presumption. The book now in its fourth edition is published by Téqui (Douniol), Paris.

Lethielleux (Paris) publishes a brief but caustic review of M. Loisy's critique of the Gospels, by the Jesuit Father Jubaru, under the title of *M. Loisy et la Critique des Évangiles.* The substance of this study appeared, we believe, originally in the *Civiltà Cattolica.* But what makes it particularly valuable in its present form is the *table analytique* at the end of the brochure, which locates the separate topics dealt with in detail.

The *Bulletin* of the Catholic Educational Association, containing the report of the proceedings and addresses of the fifth annual meeting, held at Cincinnati (6-9 July, 1908), is a repertory of valuable information and practical suggestion on the leading subjects falling within the chief departments of our educational system—the parish school, the college, and the ecclesiastical seminary. It gives one a very good survey of the educational field—the work being done, the methods employed, the confronting problems, the strength-expending as well as the weaker aspects and deficiencies. The clergy working in the respective departments cannot fail to derive profit from the papers, carefully prepared and well written by experienced teachers, while the discussion following the addresses will be found almost equally suggestive. Seminary superiors and

professors will find some good things to think about, and to do, in the papers on "Habits of Study". The contribution on the "Study of Social Problems in the Seminary"—"the problems" of course, being outside and "the study" within the institution—are timely and needed declarations.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

SERMONS. By the Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D. Edited by the Rev. J. H. Cronenberger, C.S.Sp. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey. 1908. Pp. 462.

THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAL IN THE MINISTRY. The Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in the Year 1908. By William Herbert Perry Faunce, President of Brown University. New York, London, Bombay: The Macmillan Co. 1908. Pp. 286. Price, $1.25 *net.*

TRACTATUS DE VERA RELIGIONE. Auctore Joanne Muncunill, S.J. Cum superiorum permissu. Barcinone (Barcelona): Gustavus Gili, Editor. 1909. Pp. viii-424. Pr. 8 pesetas.

OUR FAITH. By Cecil Lyburn. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers; London: Catholic Truth Society. 1908. Pp. 88. Price, $0.25 *net; 3d.*

VIDA DE SANTA TERESA DE JESUS. Por el P. Francisco de Ribera, S.J. Nueva edición, aumentada con una introducción, copiosas notas y apéndices por el P. Jaime Pons, S.J. Precede á la "Vida" un estudio preliminar: "Santa Teresa de Jesús, Doctora Mística," por el Rmo. P. Luis Martin, Prepósito General de la misma Compânia. Edición ilustrada con el Retrato de la Santa, Grabado por Maura, una Lámina y un Mapa de los Itinerarios de Santa Teresa. (Con las debidas licencias.) Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, Editor, Calle de la Universidad, 45. 1908. Pp. xxxii-666. Pr. 8 pesetas.

LITURGICAL.

GRADUALE Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae de Tempore et de Sanctis, SS. D. N. Pii X. Pontificis Maximi jussu restitutum et editum, ad exemplar Editionis Typicae concinnatum, et rhythmicis signis a Solesmensibus Monachis diligenter ornatum. Romae, Tornaci: Desclée & Socii. 1908. Pp. xx-605-223-162.

GRADUALE Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae de Tempore et de Sanctis, SS. D. N. Pii X. Pontificis Maximi jussu restitutum et editum, cui addita sunt Festa Novissima. Ad exemplar Editionis Typicae. Romae, Tornaci: Desclée & Socii. 1908. Pp. xvi-605-223-162.

THE DIVINE LITURGY OF OUR FATHER AMONG THE SAINTS JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Done into English with an Introduction and Notes by Adrian Fortescue, Clerk of the Latin Rite. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers; London: Catholic Truth Society. 1908. Pp. 131. Price, $0.25 *net; 6d.*

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND SCIENCE. Contents: "*Agnosticism, Modern Science and Ancient Faith, Science and its Counterfeit,*" and "*Some Scientifical Inexactitudes,*" by the Rev. John Gerard, S.J.; "*Pantheism,*" by William Matthews; "*Reason and Instinct, The Powers and Origin*

of the Soul," and "*The Use of Reason*," by the Rev. P. M. Northcote; "*Scientific Facts and Scientific Hypotheses*," and "*Some Debts which Science owes to Catholics*," by B. C. A. Windle, M.D., F.R.S.; "*The Decline of Darwinism*," by Walter Sweetman. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers; London: Catholic Truth Society. 1908. Price, $0.40 *net.*

CATHOLIC SOCIALISM. By Francesco S. Nitti, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Naples, author of "Population and the Social System". Translated from the second Italian edition by Mary Mackintosh. With an Introduction by David G. Ritchie, M.A., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of St. Andrews. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan & Co. 1908. Pp. 432. Price, $2.75.

PRINCIPLES OF LOGIC. By George Hayward Joyce, S.J., M.A. Oriel College, Oxford, Professor of Logic at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. New York, London, Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1908. Pp. 431. Pr. $2.50.

HISTORICAL.

THE MONUMENTS OF CHRISTIAN ROME FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE RENAISSANCE. By Arthur L. Frothingham, Ph.D., Sometime Associate Editor of the American School at Rome, and Professor of Archaeology and Ancient History at Princeton University. New York, London, Bombay: Macmillan Co. 1908. Pp. 412. Price, $2.25 *net.*

HENRY STUART, CARDINAL OF YORK AND HIS TIMES. By Alice Shield, Joint-Author of "The King Over the Water." With an Introduction by Andrew Lang. With Illustrations. Longmans, Green & Co.: New York. 1908. Pp. xvi-353. Price, $3.50 *net.*

SOME NOTABLE ALTARS in the Church of England and the American Episcopal Church. By the Rev. John Wright, D.D., LL.D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, St. Paul, Minn. With one hundred and fourteen full-page plates. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. x-383. Price, $6.00 *net.*

CHRISTIAN KNIGHTHOOD. By Joseph G. Anderson. No. 21, 8 November, 1908, of the *Catholic Mind*.. New York: The Messenger, Fordham University. Pp. 14. Price, $0.05.

EDUCATIONAL.

CHILD STUDY AND EDUCATION. By C. E. Burke, Author of "The Structure of Life", "The Value of Life", etc. With a Preface by Canon Hogan, D.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1908. Pp. 184. Price, $0.75 *net.*

TEXT-BOOK OF SCHOOL AND CLASS MANAGEMENT. Theory and Practice. By Felix Arnold, A.B., Pd.D., Ph.D. New York, London, Bombay: The Macmillan Co. 1908. Pp. 409. Price, $1.25 *net.*

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION BULLETIN. Vol. V. No. 1. November, 1908. Report of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Fifth Annual Meeting at Cincinnati, Ohio, 6, 7, 8, and 9 July, 1908. Pp. 480. Columbus, Ohio: Catholic Educational Association.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, for the Year ended June 30, 1907. Volume I. (Whole Number 383.) Washington: Government Printing Office. 1908. Pp. viii-524.

EARLY CHRISTIAN HYMNS. Translations of the Verses of the Most Notable Latin Writers of the Early and Middle Ages. By Daniel Joseph Donahoe. New York: The Grafton Press. 1908. Pp. 265. Price, $2.00 *net;* postpaid, $2.15.